

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { J. T. SHEPPARD, M.A., Litt.D., King's College, Cambridge.  
{ R. W. LIVINGSTONE, M.A., Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

## Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. CUNY, LL.D., F.R.S., Chairman.  
Prof. A. F. DOBSON, M.A., Hon. Treasurer. Prof. A. G. LEAKE, LL.D., F.R.S., Hon. Secretary.  
Prof. SILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt., F.R.S., F.R.S.L. With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the WATKINS, M.A., Classical Association.  
A. D. GODLEY, D.Litt., Representing the Oxford Philological Society.  
Prof. SIR WILLIAM BUDGE, D.Litt., LL.D., F.R.S., Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.  
With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;  
Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, Toronto;  
Prof. F. G. THOMAS, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol XXXV

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1921

Nos. 5, 6

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS...	85	REVIEWS—continued:	
VERSION: SHENKIN AND W. T. V...	85	The Agamemnon of Aeschylus (Davis and Murray), W. R. PATON...	107
THE REPORT OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S COMMITTEE ON THE CLASSICS IN EDUCATION. J. W. MACKAIL...	86	A History of Greek Public Finance (Andreades), M. CARY...	108
THE OCTAVIA. F. L. LUCAS...	91	Les Cultes Païens dans l'Empire Romain (Toussaint), C. BAILEY...	110
THE HOMERIC HYMNS (XV.). T. L. AGAR...	93	Late Latin (Salonius), W. M. LINDSAY...	112
NOTES:		Giuliano l'Apostata (Rostagni), ALICE GARDNER...	113
Notes on Aeschylus. AUSTIN SMYTH...	97	Zagreus, Studi sull' Orismo (Macchiolo), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE...	114
Aeschylus, <i>Choephori</i> 296. J. U. POWELL...	99	The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil (Sargeant), H. P. CHOLMELEY...	116
Aeschylus, <i>Agamemnon</i> . J. C. LAWSON...	100	De Hercle, Mehercle, ceterisque id genus particulis (Gagner), E. A. SONNENSCHN...	117
Emendations of Xenophon's <i>Hellenica</i> . ARTHUR PLATT...	100	Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi (Steele and Fulton), C. C. J. W...	118
Horace, <i>Odes</i> I. viii. 1-2. H. W. GARROD...	102	Phillimore's Second Edition of Statius' <i>Silvae</i> . J. WRIGHT DUFF...	120
Horace, <i>Epp.</i> 1. 2. 30, 31. W. R. INGE...	103	Virgile et les Origines d'Osia (Cassopisto), H. E. BUTLER...	121
Virgil's 'Eclogues': A Metrical Clue to the Order of Composition. ALEXANDER J. D. PORTNUS...	103	The Greek Orators (Dobson), J. E...	125
Martial IX. 21. S. GASSLER...	104	Greek History: Its Problems and its Meaning (Walker), M. C...	126
HEPIARTOI (ΕΠΑΙ). G. C. RICHARDS...	105	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS...	126
Etruscan Inscriptions. W. MADELEY...	105	BOOKS RECEIVED...	131
REVIEWS:			
Greco-Roman and Arabic Bronze Instruments and their Medico-Surgical Use (Holt), CLIFFORD ALLBUTT...	106		

(The Editors request that books for review be sent, not to them direct, but to the Publishers.)

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. 6d. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.75.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, 2, The College, Epsom; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Professor Pearson, Etonfield, King's Gap, Hoylake, Cheshire, and Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss Hilda Livesey, 155, Oswald Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Miss Margaret Hooker, Secondary School for Girls, Erdington, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss Wilkinson, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. Stradwick, City of London School for Girls, Carmelite Street, E.C.4; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss M. L. Newman, 7, College Street, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Mr. D. Emrys Evans, University College, Bangor; and Professor Dawson, Northcote House, Apollo Bander, Bombay.

### BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND  
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

**J. POOLE & CO.**

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD  
LONDON, W.C. 2.

### THE PLACE-NAMES OF ENGLAND AND WALES

By the Rev. JAMES B. JOHNSTON,  
M.A., B.D., Author of "The Place-  
Names of Scotland," etc. Medium  
8vo. 18s. net.

"It is a very fine attempt of the compass of the whole subject, which has hitherto been accomplished, and it very worthily represents the twenty years of labour given to it."—*The Observer*.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

## THE SUBJECT INDEX TO PERIODICALS

### CLASS LIST FOR LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Classical, Oriental and Primitive, 1915, 8s. net; 1916, 2s. 6d. net; 1917-19, 2s. 6d. net.

### CLASS LISTS FOR 1917-19

Subscription for Class Lists for 1917-19 (including Author Index for the same period), 2s. 6d. in paper covers.

Or Separately:

A Theology and Philosophy, 175 cols. 7s. 6d. net.  
B History, Politics, and Economic Sciences, 470 cols.  
51 1s. net.  
C Education and Child Welfare, 88 cols. 4s. net.  
D Fine Arts and Archaeology, 220 cols. 2s. net.  
E Music, 90 cols. 2s. 6d. net.

F Language and Literature.  
Part 1. Classical, Oriental, and Primitive, 54 cols.  
2s. 6d. net.  
Part 2. Modern European, including Bibliography and  
Library Management, 122 cols. 5s. net.  
G Science and Technology, including Hygiene and Sport,  
110 preparation.

Sets of the above Class Lists for 1916, £1 11s. 6d.

Sets of the above Class List for 1915, £1 11s. 6d.

Consolidated Volume for 1915-16. Revised with additions. Art. 11mm. royal 4to. pp. xvi, 344. 2s. 4d.

Obtainable from THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, STANLEY HOUSE, 33 BLOOMSBURY SQUARE, W.C. 1.



A

pro  
cel  
nu  
me  
suc  
of  
ap  
ess  
po  
vo  
del  
to  
an  
ab  
On  
rep  
ser  
étu  
l'es

so  
ha  
sta

I N  
In  
I n  
Bu  
Ha  
Ch  
I w  
W

Is  
I n  
No  
Til  
Mu  
W  
I w  
Th

N



# The Classical Review

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1921

## EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

THE hospitality of Cambridge, the presence of American scholars, an excellent Presidential Address, and a number of stimulating papers, made the meeting of the Classical Association a success. We wish that Professor Rand, of Harvard, could have heard the applause which greeted his delightful essay on *Fortunatus*. On practical policy Professor Harrower made a provocative and suggestive speech, but the debate was disappointing. We wanted to hear more facts about the experience and actual difficulties of teachers, less about the admitted merits of our case. On that topic Dr. Couchoud, the genial representative of France, said in one sentence all that need be said: 'Les études classiques servent à former l'esprit, et l'esprit sert à tout.'

During the past few months the Association, with the Classical Journals, has had to record the loss of several stalwart friends, including Dr. Warde

Fowler, Sir William Peterson, whose place as correspondent of this *Review* is now filled by Professor Maurice Hutton, of Toronto, Mr. W. R. Paton, and Mr. A. M. Cook, formerly Assistant-Editor. We much regret that the heavy pressure on our space makes it impossible to publish a full account of these scholars, whose loss we deplore.

In the present number we print an article by Dr. Mackail on the Report of the Prime Minister's Committee. We hope that readers will send us their opinions on this important matter, and we intend to devote some part of the December number to a selection from the correspondence. Finally, the arrears of reviews and original matter alike are so serious that we are obliged to hold up many contributions and to make considerable use of small print. The remedy is simple. Only an increase in the number of subscribers can justify an increase in the size of the *Review*.

## VERSION.

I NE'ER could any lustre see  
In eyes that would not look on me;  
I ne'er saw nectar on a lip,  
But where my own did hope to sip.  
Has the maid who seeks my heart  
Cheeks of rose untouched by art?  
I will own their colour true,  
When yielding blushes aid their hue.

Is her hand so soft and pure?  
I must press it, to be sure;  
Nor can I be certain then,  
Till it, grateful, press again.  
Must I, with attentive eye,  
Watch her heaving bosom sigh?  
I will do so, when I see  
That heaving bosom sigh for me.

SHERIDAN.

QUID si lucentes sibi Lydia iactat ocellos?  
sit mihi, quae soli lux mihi sola nitet;  
quid si nectareis iactat se Lydia labris?  
quod mea libabunt oscula, nectar erit.  
'En! color eximius nullique obnoxius arti:  
infecere suae virginis ora rosae.'  
has tu nativas si vis me teste probari,  
conscius inficiat virginis ora rubor.  
num manus, ut fama est, mollis, num  
pura puellae?  
ne dubitem, prius est ista premenda mea;  
ac ne pressa quidem mihi protinus illa  
placebit,  
ni manus et nostram presserit ipsa  
manum.  
me spectare iubes, tumeant quo turbida  
motu  
pectora, virgineos sollicitante sinus:  
nempe vel iniussus pectusque sinumque  
tuebor,  
causa ubi iam fuero, cur moveantur, ego.

W. T. V.

### THE REPORT OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S COMMITTEE ON THE CLASSICS IN EDUCATION.

THIS Report is dated June 7, and was published July 20 last. The eighteen months occupied by the Committee's investigations were not excessive, in view of the inevitable cumbrousness of procedure, the immense mass of the material supplied or collected, and the 140 witnesses who gave personal evidence. The ground has, for the first time, been fully traversed. The results are to be seen, not merely in the conclusions to which the Committee came and the specific recommendations which they make, but also in two facts of the highest importance. These are, first, that we now for the first time know (if not exactly, yet substantially) where we are as regards the position of the Classics and the machinery of classical education, and that this knowledge is accessible to the whole public; secondly, that the problem is set forth in its relation to the whole sphere and compass of national education. The final recommendation of the Committee is that the Reports of the four Committees on Science, Modern Languages, English, and Classics should be considered jointly, and that the elements of agreement in them should be the basis for organising schemes of education both in schools and in Universities.

The large public, who are frankly uninterested either in the Classics or in education, will not read the Report. What will soak through to them 'by indirections' will not be the conspectus of the facts; it will be on the one hand a certain number of the *media axiomata* laid down in the Report, and on the other some portions of the practical advice given on the reference under which the Committee worked. Like all such Reports, this one will be used as a magazine, out of which arguments may be drawn in support of views already held. It may be possible, if so it is most desirable, to set forth its substance briefly and yet with approximate accuracy, in a popular form, intelligible and even, perhaps, attractive to the plain man. At all events, all members of the Classical Association,

whether or not they are professionally engaged in study or teaching of the Classics, can do something of the kind in their own immediate surroundings; and it is their clear duty to do so. For that purpose the Report must be studied and mastered in detail.

This paper is accordingly meant for preliminary guidance, *ad narrandum non ad probandum*. It would be impossible within its limits to analyse a document packed with matter and filling more than 300 closely printed pages. Even the summary of recommendations covers fourteen. The sections (Parts V. to VII.) dealing with Scotland, Ireland, and Wales must be for the moment set aside; and as regards the main body of the Report, all that can be done is to select and emphasise what seem the cardinal points. The definition and vindication of the Classics as an element in individual and national welfare requires little or no comment. The more detailed suggestions for extending the field, increasing the potency, and improving the methods of classical education require, and no doubt will receive, a fuller scrutiny.

But first it may be well to note a group of fallacies which vitiate much of both educational theory and educational practice, for their influence is visible in certain parts of this Report. One is that boys or girls are divided by nature, and can be divided for education, into two kinds—those who have and those who have not 'a capacity for literary subjects': as if language, the vehicle of all thought and the motive force towards all action, were something 'literary,' and as if the object of education were not to give the nutriment which creates capacity. Another is that 'in schools where the pupils must begin to earn their living at sixteen, those subjects which have a direct bearing on their subsequent occupation must have a special importance.' That, no doubt, is true; but these subjects (apart from manual training and physical exercises) are the three R's, neither more nor less. Everything else has a bearing

just in so far as it creates capacity. The suspicion of 'vocational training' felt in the ranks of labour is based on a sound if a somewhat confused instinct. The third is that education should be so planned as to follow the line of least resistance. 'Following the boy's natural bent' is with a sounder judgment condemned by Quintilian as fitted only for the small proportion of abnormals, the *imbecilla ingenia*.

What the most cursory reading of the Report brings out, and what its detailed study confirms, is that Classics do not in fact hold a position of undue predominance in our general educational system or in any part of it; that, indeed, they do not hold any dominance at all. Given that they supply an element towards the intellectual and moral life of the nation and the individual not only important but irreplaceable,<sup>1</sup> the situation now, compared with what it was even twenty years ago, gives, so the Committee report, 'ground for grave misgiving.' 'The danger with which we are faced is not that too many pupils will learn Latin and Greek, but that the greater part of the educated men and women of the nation will necessarily grow up in ignorance of the foundations on which European society is built' (p. 43). Modern pragmatism may contend that the foundations are there, and are not affected by our knowledge or ignorance of them. This is just the misconception which knowledge of the past, did it not exist, would have to be rediscovered in order to correct, for it is only such knowledge that brings home to us the fatal results of neglecting experience. In human life the foundations and the superstructure are not detachable, for they are constituent elements of a single living organism.

The facts, as ascertained and recorded by the Committee, are these: 'In the Public Schools comparatively few boys are learning Greek.' 'Latin tends more and more to be dropped in the higher forms.' None of the

new Provided Schools have yet been able to develop a classical tradition. In nearly 1,000 schools (those belonging to the Head Masters' Conference and the Head Masters' and Head Mistresses' Associations), with over 260,000 pupils, boys and girls, Greek is being taught only (in round numbers) to 7,000 boys and 450 girls. The Report prudently forbears from treading on the hot ashes of compulsory Greek as an entrance test for the Universities. What it brings out, however, is how modern a thing compulsory Greek is. At Oxford and Cambridge it is a creation of the nineteenth century; in Scotland it only held good from 1858 to 1892.

Against Latin there is no wide or deep popular prejudice. Local educational authorities are as a rule quite friendly to it. The general public realise that there is some use in it, and are even disposed to agree that without it secondary education is incomplete. But in the list of schools just cited a considerable number do not teach Latin at all; and in the whole of them little more than 2 per cent. of the pupils continue it beyond the First Examination stage. It is clear that if Latin is to be an integral part of secondary education, its study should normally be continued up to the end of school life. But it is also clear that, with more skilful school organisation from the earliest stages upward, pupils whose formal education stops at sixteen can easily by that time have obtained a good grounding in Latin, a fair ability in handling it, and a capacity for carrying forward or resuming its study later.

The upshot of the evidence on the minds of the Committee is to be gathered from their list of recommendations. These are unanimous; there are no dissents or reservations. An unanimous report, while not without the elements of weakness or ambiguity that attach to all compromises, carries great weight. True, it is made by a body all of whom have had 'the inestimable advantage of an education in which the Classics played a conspicuous part,' and of whom it may accordingly be suspected by hostile critics that (to quote their own words) 'our view of the question is distorted

<sup>1</sup> This could hardly be put better than it is put in the impressive concluding paragraph of the Report, p. 268. 'That is our case; we should only weaken it by bringing in secondary arguments, many of which are debatable, and some (if we will be frank) are sophistical.'

by our individual predilections.' But it means that within the camp there is substantial agreement. The Classics have suffered much from quarrels among their supporters or exponents—*nullas infestas hominibus bestias*, said Julian, *ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum*—and might be easier about their enemies if they could sometimes be saved from their friends.

There are in all fifty-seven recommendations, under eighteen heads. Their range is very wide, their relative importance very varied. A few will rouse sharp contention. A few others are only uncontentious because they are so vague. But four may be singled out as cardinal. Their significance will be best seen by their being set out in two pairs:

#### LATIN.

A. Latin to be a normal part of the curriculum for all pupils in Public and Secondary Schools.

B. Latin to be retained or reinstated (as the case may be) as a necessary subject in all University Arts Courses.

#### GREEK.

C. Knowledge of Greek to be required from all teachers of Latin.

D. Greek to be accepted as an universal alternative to Latin in all public examinations, and, 'so far as possible,' in all School and University curricula.

Of these four, the first three are the key to the whole situation. The fourth bears the aspect of a formula arrived at in order to secure unanimity. Is it a pious doctrine, or one meant to mould actual usage? If the latter, it is not clear that its implications have been thought out: at all events, they are not stated. If the former, one understands why there is no suggestion that knowledge of Latin should be required from all teachers of Greek. Perhaps all it means is conveyed in the words (p. 121) 'to secure that boys should be given the opportunity of acquiring some knowledge of Greek, and if they have no time to pursue both, of making the choice'—when?—'between it and Latin.' Perhaps we may let it go at that. Of Latinless

Greek—Greek not interpreted, or as some would say, wrongly I think, diluted, into the terms of the Latin mind—we have too little experience to judge how it would work. It might act as an intoxicant, or as an explosive, or it might not act at all. Of Homer indeed this is not true; but that is because Homer, to put it in the form of a paradox, is not Greek. Will any one be bold enough to revive the Roman doctrine and practice of beginning Greek with Homer? That would mean, of course, a revolution in Greek teaching.

To these four cardinal recommendations are to be added six others, the first five of which are all of high importance, and not only so, but are capable of being carried into effect by administrative action. The Committee advise:

1. Organised transfer of pupils, with the co-operation of head-masters and head-mistresses, at an age not later than fourteen, from schools which do not to schools which do provide a full Classical Course.

2. Replacement of Advanced Courses by free combinations of advanced work; or, so far as that may be impracticable, recognition of Advanced Courses including Latin (or Greek) alone.

3. Higher allowance for Classics in the Civil Service Examinations, both Class I. and Clerical.

4. Retention of all the existing provision of Classical Scholarships at Oxford and Cambridge, and increased provision in the other Universities.

5. Reinstatement in elementary education of the teaching of formal grammar, as the basis of all linguistic and literary study whether of the mother tongue or of any other language, ancient or modern.

6. 'Measures to be devised by the Board of Education' towards giving Greek a footing, or preventing its disappearance, in schools.

On these a few observations may be added:

1. The question of transfer is full of difficulties. Without loyal co-operation on the part of school authorities, and cheerful acquiescence on the part of parents, the system could not work at all. But even so, it is a desperate



remedy. It might even aggravate the drawbacks which it is meant to remove. Break of gauge is in itself always awkward and wasteful. A double break of gauge at eleven and fourteen is still more so. Further, transfer from one school to another before the First Examination stage would *pro tanto* dislocate the whole school organisation, besides making it more difficult than ever for the former school to develop. Patience, and advance, however slow, on a broad front are needed. But meanwhile a provisional solution may perhaps be found in encouragement of transfer at the First Examination stage, and its discouragement earlier. This means that for such pupils, at any rate, Greek will not be begun before fifteen: and they would tend to set the pattern for the whole school. But that need not be an unmixed misfortune. If recommendations *A*, *B*, and *C* were accepted and made fully operative, the study of Greek would be begun with some marked advantages, and could be both much more rapid and much more effective. Between fifteen and eighteen Greek could be mastered up to an adequate point: and these are just the years in which it could be attacked with the necessary interest and intelligence. This, or something very like it, was in effect the doctrine of the great humanists. 'When they had herd me speak of ye greke literature or lerning,' More writes of his Utopians, 'they made wonderfull earneste and importunate sute vnto me that I would teach and instructe them in that tonge and learninge. I beganne therfore to reade vnto them, at the first truelie more because I would not seme to refuse the labour, then that I hooped that they would any thing profite therein. But when I had gone forward a litle, I perceaued incontinente by their diligence, that my laboure should not be bestowed in vaine. In lesse then thre yeres space there was nothing in the greke tonge that they lacked. They were hable to rede good authors withoute anie staye.' For confirmation of this doctrine or prophecy, see pp. 122 and 175 of the Report.

2. As regards Advanced Courses. They were initiated as a war-emergency

measure, for valid reasons. They were expressly stated to be provisional and tentative. Nobody, so far as I am aware, liked them much, or contemplated their permanence. Much of the adverse criticism they have incurred is due to ignorant or wilful misconception of this fact. Already, since the issue of the Report, effect has been given to the second half of this recommendation by the institution of the new D Courses in the Regulations of 1921.

3 and 4. These hardly call for comment. The former is welcome as a step made towards economy and efficiency by substitution of induced for forced draught. The only criticism to be made on the latter is one which, while it is undeniably serious, applies to the whole scholarship system, and indeed to free or bounty-fed education itself.

5. This is directly educational, and of high importance. The introduction of a rational and simple standardised grammar as the basis of all language teaching, while it would not work miracles, would perhaps do as much as any other single thing to ease the working and increase the efficiency of the whole educational machine from top to bottom.

There remains 6. Here we come to the kernel of the Greek problem; and here, unfortunately, the Report gives no guidance. There needed no ghost to tell us that the Board of Education should devise measures for retaining or introducing Greek in schools, or to express regret (p. 63) that 'they have apparently not thought it possible' to do so. But when we (or the Board) ask, What measures? the detailed recommendations of the Committee may be scrutinised in vain for an answer. We have to fall back on the cardinal recommendations: or, rather, on the first three of the four; for it will hardly be contended that Greek will be, to any substantial extent, either retained in or introduced into schools merely by its recognition as a possible alternative to Latin. But if Latin were required as an integral subject in the curricula of Secondary Schools and in University Arts Courses, and if adequate knowledge of Greek were required in all teachers of Latin,

the naturalisation of the Classics in education would be secured. This cannot be effected immediately; it is idle to imagine that the situation can be retrieved by a stroke of the pen. But if it is a fixed and defined aim, continuous and accelerating progress can be made towards its substantial attainment. Supply will create demand, and demand create supply. Departmental regulations are little more than a codification of usage; but that little more may be all-important in directing movement. A generation hence, it may be hoped that usage, in both these matters, will be so general that it can, if necessary, be registered in enactment. But if this is to happen, there must be the most persistent and strenuous effort on the part of the Classical Association, not to cry its own wares, which is easy and useless, but to bring about further improvement in the spirit and methods of classical teaching, and in the qualifications to be looked for, as a mere matter of honesty and self-respect, in teachers of the Classics. The rest will be done by growing public appreciation of the results, in the product of the schools, of the strengthening, enlarging, and vitalising influence which Latin and Greek, or Latin alone, as taught by competent scholars to whom the Classics really mean something, can exert on the average boy or girl. Of this task it may be said in general, as Sir William Ramsay says in particular (pp. 190, 203) of the study of ancient geography, that 'nothing has been done and everything remains to be done.' Or if this be too sweeping—for in the eighteen years of its existence the Classical Association has done not a little—the path of safety and of honour lies in thinking nothing done so long as anything remains to do.

A large proportion of the working classes (p. 123) 'are genuinely anxious to get the best possible education for their children'; and as to what that education is, most of them 'accept unquestioningly the advice of the teacher.' As has been said of them in another sphere, 'they don't know what they want, but they insist on having it.' When they do know, they will see that they get it. A free nation has the education, sooner or later, that

it wants to have. 'Where it is taught,' the Committee report of Greek in Scotland (p. 221), 'it is popular.' In Scotland there is still some tradition of the humanist ideal. But even in England that ideal, only seen from far off in the sixteenth century, is beginning to take shape: *nec tam aversus equos Tyria sol iungit ab urbe*.

Very special attention must accordingly be given to the section of the Report dealing with matters of method. These matters are many and varied. Among them may be singled out for prominence the building up of a historical background; the choice and treatment of texts; the place to be given to composition (on which there is much more to be said than is said by the Committee); the moral importance of school libraries; the use and abuse of translations; the scope of what are called material aids; the so-called Direct Method, on which an adverse judgment is pronounced.

The traditional method of classical teaching, so the Committee conclude, while susceptible of and calling for perpetual improvement, 'has been amply justified by results' (p. 276). But to save it from slipping back into a dead tradition, it has to be kept fluid; it has to be applied with intelligence; it has to preserve an open mind towards change; it has to be worked, and that most of all with beginners, by teachers of scholarly attainment. And beyond all these, it has to be recognised as an element in a larger system; and competition between subjects, as a phrase and as a thing, must be banished from education.

'Latin,' the Report says (p. 40), 'is suffering unduly from the competition of modern and scientific subjects.' But Latin, and Greek too, is a scientific and a modern subject. Have we at this time of day to begin to learn that competition between subjects is alike injurious to all the competitors, and is founded either on a radically vicious theory of education, or, what is nearer the truth, on a total failure to understand what education means?

The concordat arrived at in 1917—for which not only the Classical Association, but the nation, owes a debt to

Sir Frederic Kenyon which ought to be acknowledged—was perhaps the most important step taken in education for many years. It got the educational machine on to the rails. All that is wanted now to make it run is motive force, common-sense, and patience. The motive force does not come from Government Departments which release it, or from local education authorities which apply it, or from the teaching profession which uses it. It comes from the inarticulate but all-powerful national consciousness. But national consciousness, public opinion, can be formed; and now is the time to do so—now when all traditions, classical or anti-classical, are in flux. 'One of the best means of assuring the position of the Classics in the educational system of the United Kingdom' is, so the Committee find, 'that the membership of the Classical Association should be maintained and increased'; and twice over elsewhere they strongly urge all teachers of Classics to join it. Multiplication and strengthening of local branches, missionary work among the wider public, capture of the young, are named as specific aims; and the suggestion of the foundation of a Classical Institute, which should serve as the headquarters of the Classical Association and of all kindred societies, will not escape notice. But something more is wanted than machinery. What will save, not the Classics—they need

no salvation—but the study of the Classics, is, in the phrase which is perhaps the most significant in the whole Report, 'the realisation that they have something to contribute to the problems of the present day and the permanent life of man.' That this was so used to be taken for granted as self-evident. Then it was largely forgotten. It has to be realised and taught afresh. The ideal of classical education as an austere discipline must not be lost; there was never a time when it was more needed: but it must be linked up with and incorporated in the larger ideal of an enfranchised life.

One of the incomparable values of the Classics is that by their inherent virtue they supply the antidote against their own misuse. Before we set out to save the Classics, it would be well to make sure whether the Classics have saved us. Those who have really learned the lesson which the Classics teach will not feel either 'nervous alarm' or 'premature despair.' It will not even seem to them particularly useful to have 'grave misgivings.' These are not the highest or the most powerful springs of action. The price had to be paid for old crimes and follies, entrenchment in privilege, supercilious detachment, obstinate resistance to change. So far as we shared in these, we must take our punishment. But *tristitia* no less than *superbia* is one of the deadly sins.

J. W. MACKAIL.

#### THE OCTAVIA.

IN these days the usual response evoked by an allusion to the tragedies of Seneca is a grimace: with the excuse, perhaps, that the literary expression of Seneca the tragedian may be described as itself perpetually one. But it is questionable whether this modern attitude is not almost as exaggerated as Scaliger's preference of Seneca to Euripides, and Heywood's raptures about 'the flower of poets.' In any case the *Octavia* does deserve honourable exception from the general anathema.

It is not Seneca's; that is doubtless why. Its spuriousness never needed the cumbrous engines of the learned

critic to prove it; no one with any literary sense could credit the author of the lurid Thyestes with this simple little piece, pale and delicate as the figures on a Wedgwood vase. But attempts to father it on any known poet are futile guesswork; and even attempts to date it have varied from Nero's reign to the Middle Ages.

The evidence is as follows:—

First, a prophetic description of Nero's death (ll. 618-631) and a possible allusion to Vindex (255) establish a date after 68. Seneca died in 65.

Secondly, the play, though not Seneca's, is the work of an admirer

only too familiar with his drama and his prose. Now over his younger contemporaries, as Quintilian with pain records, Seneca exercised an influence amounting to obsession: on the other hand, with the accession of the Flavians came a reaction from the extravagances of the earlier empire to a new simplicity.

All this suits perfectly the combined Senecanism and simplicity, or, perhaps, *simplesse*, of the *Octavia*, if we suppose it written under the Flavians not too long after the deaths of Seneca and of Nero: for, again, its vivid touches and accuracy of detail smack far more of living memory than of the third and fourth centuries A.D.

Of other evidence worth the name there is little. But on the ground of supposed historical blunders in the play an attempt has been made by Dr. Vürtheim in his edition (Leyden, 1909) to pull down the *Octavia* to the later date.

He argues that the Prefect of the *Octavia*, who feebly tries to restrain Nero's fury against the Roman people and his wife, could not be the creation of a writer living while Tigellinus, the man who could deprave even Nero, was still remembered.

But it does not follow that the Prefect of the *Octavia* need be identified with Tigellinus at all. Burrus had two successors, Tigellinus and Faenius Rufus. The latter, according to Tacitus, was a man 'vita famaue laudatus,' though of a certain 'segnis innocentia.' He brought himself into disfavour by his loyalty to Agrippina, just as he tries to be loyal to Octavia in the play, and he joined the conspiracy of Piso in 65. But his intentions, if good, were feeble, and he vainly tried to save his own neck by persecuting his confederates. It is surely easier to suppose that the author of the *Octavia* had this well-meaning coward in mind, than that one who, whenever he lived, knew so much of Nero should have been ignorant of the almost equally infamous Tigellinus.

Dr. Vürtheim remarks that Poppaea's wickedness is equally neglected. There are only, he complains, allusions to her beauty as if she were another Helen; and she has visions like another Penelope. Elsewhere, however, he suggests that the author of the *Octavia* may have

derived his favourable view of Poppaea, who had Jewish leanings, from Josephus. But if a contemporary historian could whitewash her, why not a contemporary playwright? Further, it is not hard to trace the workings of a by no means innocent conscience in Poppaea's dream.

Parallels of expression with Tacitus are equally futile: they cannot be proved to be plagiarisms: in any case, which was the plagiarist? And lastly to urge, as does Dr. Vürtheim, that Seneca could not have been made by anyone who knew the facts to say of Octavia, 'Implebit aulam stirpe,' because she was really barren, is rather too much, seeing that her own husband had her accused of abortion at this very time (Tac. *Ann.* 14. 63).

Anything like certainty is, however, out of the question: one can at most say it seems probable that the *Octavia* with its Senecan influence and its Flavian simplicity is not much later than the genuine plays with which it became associated.

Of more interest than the date of the *Octavia* is its construction. Considering its ingenuous air, the artificiality and the meticulous symmetry of arrangement which it reveals on close examination are astonishing.

There is a symmetry in the pedimental grouping of its characters—Nero in the centre, his two contrasted ministers, Seneca and the Prefect, on either side; behind Seneca Octavia and her nurse; behind the Prefect Poppaea and hers; in the background the spirit of Agrippina, the Ate of the Palatine; in the foreground the chorus vacillating from side to side.

There is an equal symmetry in the action. Octavia relates to her nurse that she dreamt Nero killed Britannicus in her arms. Then Agrippina's ghost appears. Then Poppaea relates to her nurse that she dreamt, first that Agrippina's ghost appeared, next that Nero killed Crispinus in her arms.

The lyrics are similarly balanced. The chorus foretells to Octavia that Nero will leave her rivals as Jove left Leda, Danae, and Europa. Then they foretell to Poppaea that Jove will love her as he loved Leda, Danae, and Europa. First they sing of Agrippina's



death; then Agrippina's ghost appears. First they proclaim the rights of Octavia, then the beauties of Poppaea. They reproach Rome for not rising against Nero's new love; they reproach Rome for rising against love at all.

Finally, there are traceable through the play three 'leit-motivs,' similar to those of Aeschylus,<sup>1</sup> or Wagner, or Ibsen: all three recur for the last time in the last chorus of the play.

The first theme is the haunting dominance of the Erinys, the curse of the Julio-Claudian line, now personified, now regarded as incarnate in Agrippina. Just so the Curse of the House of Atreus in the *Agamemnon* works, now by itself, now embodied in Clytemnestra.

In the shape of Agrippina, it presides, always with its Stygian torch, at the weddings both of Nero and Octavia (23), and of Nero and Poppaea (593, 712) and foretells the Emperor's final doom.

As the personified curse, on the other hand, the Erinys, it has already watched over the murder of Messalina (264) and of Claudius (162), while Pietas fled in horror from the Palatine.

Then, in the last scene, this Avenger stands forth supreme, world-dominant. 'The deity of Pietas is broken: the gods are no more.' With a last appeal, like that of Turnus, from those deaf gods to the powers of Hell, Octavia goes out to die.

The second 'motiv' is a similar play

on Charon's 'Ship of the Dead,' and Agrippina's 'Death-ship' (125, 312, 601, 905). This, too, culminates at the close: in the ship which is to bear her to die in Pandateria, Octavia recognises the fatal vessel which bore Agrippina to her fate.

Thirdly, there is a play on the double relationship as royal brother and sister, husband and wife, of Nero and Octavia, as of Jupiter and Juno (ll. 46, 220, 282, 535, 658, 790, 828, 910). Little by little those ties dissolve before us. Divorce destroys Octavia's royalty and her wifehood, murder tramples on her sisterhood; she fades from us at the end, no more the earthly counterpart of the Queen of Heaven, but the sister in death, as in life, of the deposed and murdered Britannicus.

It all makes a strangely complex structure. Had our poet known as well to build as to plan, his work would have been really great. But, product of a decadent and senile, even though chastened, age, it lacks life; and without that the most conscientiously classical devotion to form can only conceive offspring listless and bloodless, however perfectly shaped.

Yet even so in her frail pathos, her simplicity, her pessimism, her yearning for the past, her despair of present and future, of good and God, the Octavia of this drama has to this day a weary Botticellian charm, little dreamed of by those who pass her by.

F. L. LUCAS.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. T. Sheppard, *Greek Tragedy*, pp. 36-41.

## THE HOMERIC HYMNS (XV.).

Εἰς Ἑρμῆν.

THE expression *πλήκτρῳ ἐπειρήτιζε κατὰ μέρος* (53) deserves a little consideration. If *κατὰ μέρος* means '(each string) in turn,' as Allen and Sikes say no doubt correctly, the phrase can only describe the familiar preliminary of tuning up so necessary with all stringed instruments. In The Rejected Addresses we may read how 'their various tones to tune—squeaks the fiddle sharp—and twangs the tingling harp.'

Till like great Jove the leader figuring in Attunes to order the chaotic din.

On this hypothesis *σμερδαλέον* in its ordinary acceptance might have some excuse in 54; but this conception of the passage is assuredly wrong. Hermes is not tuning up his lyre in these lines. For that purpose all that was necessary was done in 51 *συμφώνους* or *εὐφώνους* (it matters not which) *ἐνανύσσατο χορδὰς*. Now he is evidently playing music, and nothing could be more prosaic and weak than *κατὰ μέρος* *πειρήτιζε* to describe a musical performance. The author of this hymn was not such a contemptible poet as some of his editors in their wisdom are

pleased to assume. First of all against this unsuitable *κατὰ μέρος* stands the fact that *μέρος* is a word not to be found in the early epic vocabulary though trite enough in later Greek, which fully accounts for its appearance in the tradition.

The true reading here, I have little doubt, is *κατὰ μόρον*, which is exactly equivalent to the *κατὰ μοῖραν* of Π 367, where the army is in disorderly retreat,

οὐδὲ κατὰ μοῖραν πέραον πάλιν.

Hermes touched the strings 'in order due,' 'in seemly and fitting manner,' so as to produce a tune or melody. The words that follow show this plainly, and confirmation is given by 419 f., where there can be no question of trying each string in turn. Indeed the tradition there recognises this impossibility by reading erroneously *κατὰ μέλος*, which editors even more erroneously alter to *κατὰ μέρος*, after Martin. The correct reading in both passages is *κατὰ μόρον*, which was almost bound to disappear in later times because, unfortunately, like *μοῖρα*, *μόρος* had the derived meaning of 'fate,' 'doom,' so that even in epic *κατὰ μόρον* generally suggests a contrast with *ὑπὲρ μόρον*, which, as we have seen, is suggestive of the supernatural, *v. note on H. Dem.* 428.

58 ὃν πάρος ὠρίζεσκον ἑταιρείῃ φιλότῃ.

That ὃν is the cognate or internal accusative after the verb here is difficult to believe, and is certainly not rendered more credible by any of the examples quoted by Allen and Sikes. There is no proverbial element in our line as in ὁ λαγὼς τὸν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν τρέχει, no technical formula as in κινήσω τὸν ἀφ' ἱερᾶς. Undoubtedly Abel, Gemoll, and Evelyn-White are right in reading, after Ernesti, ὥς, or in the earlier writing ὅς, which invites the simple grammatical correction ὃν.

A much more serious difficulty presents itself in the form ὠρίζεσκον, which could not come from the well-established early-epic ὠρίζω (*v.* 170, xxiii. 3). So far as we know the word fell out of use and became obsolete in later Greek. Even so restoration seems to me not unattainable. Analogy would warrant the

suggestion of ὠρίσασκον and the line would read thus,

ὥς πάρος ὠρίσασκον ἑταιρείῃ φιλότῃ.

*Cf.* ὥσασκε, ἐρητύσασκε. Another iterative formed from the present tense would be ὠρίζεσκον, less likely here because its introduction involves the dropping of πάρος, *e.g.*

ὥς ποθ' ἑταιρείῃ ὠρίζεσκον φιλότῃ.

In the next line the original reading (*cf.* δ 178) was probably ὀνομακλήδην ὀνομάζων. Ὀνομακλυτόν is very weak here.

62 καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖν ἤειδε, τὰ δὲ φρεσὶν ἄλλα μενοῖνα.

By the change of one letter we get a much better reading, ἤειδ', ἔτι δέ.

69. Instead of the traditional αὐτὰρ ἄρ' Ἑρμῆς Barnes suggested αὐτὰρ ὁ γ', nor is this to be lightly rejected because an equally mistrustworthy αὐτὰρ ἄρα is found in B 103; but it may be permissible to offer ἔς as an alternative to Barnes's ὁ γ', which can hardly stand immediately before Ἑρμῆς. That the first preposition in εἰσαφίκανε should be removed from its position here is only what might be expected.

73 τῶν τότε Μαῖαδος υἱός, εὐσκοπὸς Ἀργεῖφόντης  
πεντήκοντ' ἀγέλης ἀπετάμνετο βοὺς ἐριμύκους.

It is impossible that τῶν should be correct here unless it be referred to the θεῶν μακάρων of 71, which is hardly likely. All editors and translators, so far as I can ascertain, complacently take it to mean 'of these cows,' which would, of course, require τῶν and would, moreover, involve the inevitable conclusion that Hermes stole only part of Apollo's cows, whereas it is clear enough that he took them all, leaving only the bull looking rather blue and four clever dogs, *v.* 193 ff., also 340.

Τῶν may be attributed to a foolish rhapsodist who did not fully realise the facts of the case, and was probably misled in some degree by ἀπετάμνετο, which seems to be a technical term for cattle lifting, *cf.* Σ 528 τάμνοντ' ἀμφὶ βοῶν ἀγέλας and our nautical expression 'cutting out.' I suggest that the true reading is τὰς τότε.

80. There are three places in the *Hymns* in which we find the peculiar combination θαυματὰ ἔργα: here, in 440, and in vii. 34. We have also one line,

(165) in Hesiod's *Shield of Hercules*, where it is the ill-supported reading. No further support for an adj. *θαυματός* can be found in the earlier epic, to which we may safely conclude it was quite alien, being in fact merely an importation from later usage. Pindar has it twice, *Ol.* 1. 43, *Pyth.* 10. 49. The epic adj. is *θέσκελος*, which became obsolete, *v.* Γ130 *θέσκελα ἔργα*, also λ374, 610, and we may take it as highly probable, if not certain, that such was the reading in all these three passages in the *Hymns*.

95 πολλά δ' ὄρη σκίοντα καὶ αὐλῶνας κελαδαινοὺς  
καὶ πεδί' ἀνθεμένοντα διήλασε κύδιμος Ἑρμῆς.

No one need believe and no one ought to believe that the writer of this Hymn wrote or sang *ὄρη* or even a dissyllabic *ὄρεα*, as Ilgen half-heartedly would have it. The poet had at his command two trisyllabic forms, *οὔρεα* and *ὄρεα*, but the usage of later ages was against both. So and for no other reason the tradition presents us with *ὄρη*, an epic monstrosity.

Possibly, however, there may be another reason connected with *αὐλῶνας κελαδαινοὺς*. Now *αὐλῶνες* are narrows, deep valleys, gorges, or *cañons*, as they say in America, and *κελαδαινός* as applied to them meant 'filled with the noise (κέλαδος) and tumult of the chase' (*cf.* *Ἀρτεμις κελαδαινή*). In this case Hermes is driving his cows in the night, and as far as possible in silence.

πολλά δ' ὃ γε σκίοντ' ὄρε' αὐλῶνάς τε κελαινοὺς  
καὶ πεδί' ἀνθεμένοντα διήλασε.

The adjectives indicate the character of the difficulties the little herdsman had to face, the long shadows in the mountains, the black darkness in the deep vales, and the natural desire of the cows to crop the herbage on the levels (*πεδία*).

Against this view may be set the idle idea that the author of the Hymn was afflicted with poetical incapacity and destitute of common sense; therefore objection against our tradition must always be ineffective. I do not subscribe to this. In fact, the fallibility of the tradition is amusingly exhibited within four lines. In l. 100 we read of a high-sounding personality, otherwise unknown, Megamedes,

Πάλλαντος θυγάτηρ Μεγαμηδείδω ἀνακτος.

It would be flattering this gentleman to say he was a myth. He is not even the shadow of a myth. He is an absolute nonentity, a Mrs. Harris, and as such I propose to kill him outright with a drop of ink. He has cumbered the ground long enough. I remove very gently his capital and his two false dentals, and so at last recovering his own long-lost consonants, still dentals, he emerges with adjectival faculty and power, no longer bolstering up a Titanic impostor, -*μεγαμητιέταο*-.  
Pallas himself, according to Hesiod (*Theog.* 375 f.) the son of Crius and Eurybia—a parentage unquestioned by the author of this hymn—is 'the high-counsellor prince.'

In 99 *προσεβήσεται* (not -*ατο*) should be read, *v.* Monro, *H.G.* § 41, and in 101 *Ἀλφειοῦ* rather than *Ἀλφειόν*.

103 ἀδμήτες δ' ἵκανον ἐς αἴλιον ὑψιμέλαθρον.

In view of 106 Schneidewin's *ἐπ'* might replace *ἐς* here. For *ἀδμήτες* ('unyoked,' A. and S.) *ἀκμήτες* is generally read after Ilgen. Indeed, no one could possibly imagine that the oxen arrived 'yoked.' Mr. Allen himself has suggested *ἄκμηνοι*, and I am glad to give to this the commendation I bestowed upon it twenty-four years ago (*Class. Rev.*, November, 1896). It makes good sense, *cf.* my remark on *πεδία ἀνθεμένοντα* l. 96 above, a far better sense than *ἀκμήτες*, and has this further point in its favour that the later Greeks would readily abandon an almost obsolete word for a familiar one like *ἀδμήτες*, which they might understand here, not in the strict sense of 'unyoked,' but more loosely as 'unbeaten,' 'not worn-out' by their long journey. It was really Hermes who never tired. Mr. Allen does not do himself justice here by abandoning perhaps the best conjecture he ever made—

οὐ γάρ πω τοῖον ἴδον ἀνέρος οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι.

105 ἐνθ' ἐπεὶ εὖ βοτάνης ἐπεφόρβει βοὺς ἐρμύκους  
καὶ τὰς μὲν συνέλασσαν ἐς αἴλιον ἀθρόας οὐσας  
λωτὸν ἐρεπτομένας ἡδ' ἐρσήεντα κύπειρον  
σὺν δ' ἐφόρει ξύλα πολλά, πυρὸς δ' ἐπεμαλετο  
τέχνην.

It may be taken as almost certain that Gemoll is right in reading *ἐπεὶ οὖν* instead of *ἐπεὶ εὖ* (105), and as quite certain that *ἀθρόας οὐσας* (106) is absolutely wrong and impossible. Allen

and Sikes are dogmatic as usual: 'however we account for -ās, the word (viz. ἀθρόας) is not to be disturbed.' One wonders why. Other scholars have not thought so—notably Barnes, Ilgen, Hermann, Franke, Cobet, Stadtmüller, Abel, Ludwig. Not even in meaning is ἀθρόας satisfactory. If it be proleptic, then οὐσας is worse than useless, and if there is no prolepsis it would be the worst possible policy for a cattle-driver to get his cows in a dense mass if he wished to get them through a doorway or narrow gate. But our editors never consider the facts of the case. They simply lay down the law. Then they proceed to deal with οὐσας: 'the later form is defended by *H. Apoll.* 330, where, however, emendation is easy, see note *ad loc.*'—where, indeed, as they admit, it is plain as daylight that τηλόθ' εἶδσα, not τηλόθεν οὐσα, is the true reading, and the defence is no defence at all. Even graphically the tradition τηλόθεν οὐσα is merely a correction of a wrong division (τηλόθε οὐσα) of the true reading.

Of the emendations suggested, that made by Barnes, ἀθρό' ιούσας, is the best, but is doubtful Greek for ἀθρόας or ἀθροεί ιούσας. Ἀμμυγ' ιούσας or ἀθροισθείσας would be at least admissible Greek, yet I recommend neither; for unless I am much mistaken the true reading is, in spite of any lack of Homeric authority for the actual verb, ἀφριαούσας.

The cows are in the condition we might expect after their long journey. They are 'flecked with foam.' A visit to any cattle-market would be sufficient to show the propriety of this description. Graphically the word involves the omission of one and the change of two letters only. Oppian in the *Halientica* i. 772 is, it seems, the sole authority for the verb, but he must have had some warrant for its use. It can hardly have been his own invention: cf. ἰσχάνω ἰσχανάω, ἐρυκάνω ἐρυκανάω.

In 107 ἰδ' ἐερσήεντα is undoubtedly the true reading, and the third foot is a dactyl. Epic usage here admits no denial or qualification. In all probability a comma only should follow κύπειρον, making 108 the apodosis to the ἐπεὶ of 105. Finally, the concluding

words seem to have suffered in transmission:

πυρὸς δ' ἐπεμαίετο τέχνην.

The construction is bad, for ἐπεμαίετο takes a gen. when it means to desire to aim at, e.g. K 401 δώρων ἐπεμαίετο θυμός, μ 220, ε 344. The meaning is little better, for what is 'the art of fire'? A vacuous expression intended to mean the art of producing fire, as we may here charitably suppose, but no more expressing this meaning than the art of gas or electricity, or of potatoes or onions, would signify the method of producing these articles. Allen and Sikes, untroubled by the want of sense, consider that the accusative is 'established' by 511 on the two blacks, etc., principle. The line runs

αὐτὸς δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρης σοφίης ἐκμάσσατο τέχνην.

The passage in which it stands is more than usually corrupt, but even if the tradition were otherwise immaculate and above suspicion it is surely plain as a pikestaff that ἐκμάσσατο is merely a perverted ἐκμήσατο, 'devised,' and has nothing to do with μαίομαι at all, but with μῆδομαι, cf. δ 437 δόλον δ' ἐπεμήδετο πατρί and μῆσατο *passim*. So much for the cogency and value of the 'establishing' bit of black.

Palaeographically there is little to choose between ι and ν, and Ilgen's πυρὸς δ' ἐπεμαίετο τέχνην is made almost a certainty even if it be not quite confirmed by

483 τέχνη καὶ σοφίη δεδαημένος ἐξερεείνη,

'with skill and cunning', 'artfully and wisely.' I would even suggest for 511 αὐτὸς δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρην σοφίην ἐκμήσατο τέχνην: 'but again of his own cleverness he invented another art,' 'all by himself he cleverly invented,' etc.

The actual process employed by Hermes to produce his fire, not his art of fire, is described in five lines 109-114, for one of these (111) is an impertinent and flagrant intrusion which makes Hermes play the part of Prometheus, πῦρ ἀνέδωκε, a hopeless and grotesque absurdity, accepted by Allen and Sikes with blind credulity and ill judgment. The first two lines stand thus:

δάφνης ἀγλαὸν ὄξον ἐλὼν ἐπέλεψε σιδήρῳ  
ἄρμενον ἐν παλάμῃ, ἀμπνυτο δὲ θερμὸς αὐτῇ.



Now ἐπέλεψε is usually understood to mean 'peeled,' which is, of course, perfectly right. Hermes stripped the laurel branch *on the surface*, i.e. removed the bark. But Allen and Sikes blunder as usual by translating ἐπί 'prune to a point,' 'sharpen.' 'This sense of ἐπί in composition,' they say, 'is recognised by the lexicons in ἐπικόπτειν, ἐπιτέμνειν.' I find no such recognition, and until I see some evidence to the contrary, which will be difficult to produce, I shall venture to regard the statement as erroneous. Even if it were correct, it must be obvious that nothing could be more likely to make the 'borer,' the τρύπανον, ineffective and useless than to sharpen it and so reduce the frictional surface moving on the block, the στορεύς.

But the best MS. *M* has ἐνίαλλε, not ἐπέλεψε, and this or a close approximation to this, ἐνίαλλε, I take to be the true reading here. Kuhn's idea that a line has been lost between 109 and 110 is quite an unnecessary complication. The statement of the text is that Hermes dashed the laurel stick (ἄλλε) or moved it to and fro (ἔλλε or εἶλε, cf. Soph. *Antig.* 340 ἰλλομένων ἀρότρων) on the iron (ἐν σιδήρῳ). The iron is evidently the storeus, and it may well be that this rubbing-block was covered with a thin iron plate which from the known properties of the metal would not materially alter its frictional efficiency and would certainly make it more

durable. At the same time we must not be oblivious to the possibility that the poet originally wrote in plain terms ἐνίαλλε στορῇ, of which σιδήρῳ is a later perversion and needless metrical correction. The early epic writer faced a difficulty of this kind without hesitation, and we meet not only ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον etc. ἢ σκέπαρνον, but also the more closely analogous twice-repeated ἐκ δὲ στέατος.

Allen and Sikes support Kuhn with this notable but singularly ill-considered statement, which cannot be allowed to pass without notice: 'the words ἄρμενον ἐν παλάμῃ are appropriate not to the τρύπανον but to the στορεύς, which needed to be kept steady.' They evidently mistake the στορεύς for a modern match-box. Holding in the hand would not secure steadiness for this or any analogous mechanical process such as filing or sawing. There is no need to go to an engineering works for information on this question.

Dixeris haec inter varicosos centuriones,  
Continuo crassum ridet Pulfennius ingens  
Et centum Graecos curto centusse licetur.

We require not the skilled advice of any foreman over a hundred workmen. A very small acquaintance with implements and tools is sufficient to enable us to feel sure that the τρύπανον, not the στορεύς, was adapted for the hand to grip.

T. L. AGAR.

## NOTES.

### NOTES ON AESCHYLUS.

#### *Supplices* 6-10 :

οὐτὼν' ἐφ' αἵματι δημηλασίαν  
ψήφῳ πόλεως γνωσθεῖσαι,  
ἀλλ' αὐτογένητον φύλαξανοραν  
γάμον Αἰγύπτου παίδων ἀσεβῆ τ'  
ὀνοταζόμεναι.

The third line is corrupt. Might we not drop the letter φ which spoils the metre, and change ν into γ? Read ἀλλ' αὐτογενῆ τὸν ὕλαξαγορᾶν, and join αὐτογενῆ and ἀσεβῆ as predicates of γάμον, 'but objecting to the marriage with the clamorous sons of Aegyptus as incestuous and impious.' ὕλαξαγόρας,

a compound of ὕλασσω and ἀγορή, is analogous with Ἀναξαγόρας, λαβραγόρας. It depicts the cousins of the Danaids as a yelping pack in hot pursuit. So in 776 they are called μεμαργωμένοι κυνοθρασεῖς.

#### *Supplices* 271-3:

τὰ δὲ παλαιῶν αἱμάτων μᾶσμασιν  
χρανθεῖς' ἀνῆκε γαῖα μηνεῖται ἄκη,  
δρακονθόμιλον δυσμενῆ ξυνοικταν.

μηνιτὴ δῖακη, Porson; μηνιταῖ' ἄκη, Hermann; μηνιαῖ' ἄκη, Dindorf. None of these seems quite to meet the case. I should trace the source of corruption

a little deeper, in the substitution of M owing to the collocation of ΑΔ, reading *δηναία δάκη*, 'monsters which the earth for a long time produced (till Apis cleansed it).' *δηναία* agreeing with *γαῖα* qualifies the action of *ἀνῆκε*, as in *τριταῖος ἐλθεῖν* and the like. The same word has been corrupted in *Eum.* 848 and 880.

#### *Supplices* 300-3 :

ΧΟ. μὴ καὶ λόγος τις Ζῆνα μυχθῆναι βροτῶ;  
ΒΑ. καὶ κρυπτά γ' Ἦρας ταῦτα παλλαγμάτων.

The second verse is deficient in sense and metre. Professor Tucker reads *κοῦ κρυπτά γ' Ἦρας ταῦτ' ἀπ' ἀντιταγμάτων*, 'Aye, and the matter was no secret from Hera's counter-workings.' This seems to me to make excellent sense, but we might keep a little nearer to the text by adding three letters instead of altering three: *ταῦτ' ἀπ' (ἀντ)αλλαγμάτων*, 'from the *reprisals* of Hera.' *ἀντάλλαγμα*, which occurs in *Eur. Or.* 1157, is something taken in exchange for another. Here it either has the general sense of *reprisals* or a special reference to the taking away of Io's human form in revenge for the love of Zeus, as stated below.

#### *Supplices* 317-9 :

ΒΑ. τίς οὖν ὁ Διὸς πόρτις εἴχεται βοῆς;  
ΧΟ. Ἐπαφος ἀληθῶς ῥυσίων ἐπάνυμος.  
ΒΑ. (Ἐπαφου δὲ τίς ποτ' ἐξέφυ παρώνυμος ;)  
ΧΟ. Λιβύη, μέγιστον γῆς (λίβος) καρπουμένη.

A verse is wanting here, which I have supplied as above for the sake of illustration. Professor Tucker suggests that it probably began with some case of Ἐπαφος, and was passed over in copying through this resemblance to the preceding line. If the ending was also similar, it would make the accident still more likely. The sense is, 'And who was born from Epaphus with a name to correspond?'—that is to say, with some name indicative of the blessing foreshown in his. Epaphus (from *ἐπαφάω*) is 'the petted darling' of Zeus. He is 'held in the hand' of the Most High, like a treasured pledge or security, hence *ἀληθῶς ῥυσίων ἐπάνυμος*, the phrase in such a case being *ἐφάπτεσθαι ῥυσίων*. We might therefore supply the missing word in the next verse as shown above, 'Λιβύη, who reaps the fruits of greatest *λίβος* on earth,' the rich

stream of Nile. She thus manifests in her name the blessing bestowed on her father. So *Prom.* 877 Ἐπαφον, ὃς καρπώσεται ὅσην πλατύρρους Νεῖλος ἀρδεύει χθόνα.

#### *Supplices* 324-6 :

ΒΑ. καὶ τοῦδ' ἀνοίγε τοῖνομ' ἀφθόνω λόγῳ  
ΧΟ. Ἀργυπτος. εἰδῶς δ' ἀμὺν ἀρχαῖον γένος  
πράσσοις ἂν ὡς Ἀργεῖον ἀνστήσας στόλον.

The tense of *ἀνστήσας* seems impossible. The King has not yet raised up the suppliants from their sanctuary, and cannot therefore be invited to act on the assurance that he has done so. The second hand has written *ἀντήσας* in the margin, which suggests that *ἀντλήσας* is the word that Aeschylus wrote, 'act as having taken into your town an Argive (not a foreign) train.' The Danaids claim the rights of consanguinity with Argos. So *Theb.* 780, πόλις ἄντλον οὐκ ἐδέξατο, 'the town took in no bilge,' i.e. let in no foreign foe.

#### *Supplices* 792-3 :

ἀσφυκτον δ' οὐκέτ' ἂν πελοὶ κέαρ.  
κελαινόχρως δὲ πάλλεται μὲν καρδία.

*ἄσφυκτον*, 'without pulsation,' Bentley; *ἄλυκτον*, Hermann, with *νόαρ*, 'spectre,' at the end; *ἀφύκτων*, Tucker, with *σκέπαρ*, 'refuge,' at the end. We might change a single letter, reading *ἀμυκτὸν* from *ἀμύσσω*, as *ὀρυκτὸν* from *ὀρύσσω*, 'then would my heart be no longer rent with fear, whereas now,' etc., *Pers.* 117 φρήν ἀμύσσεται φόβῳ, 164 καρδίαν ἀμύσσει φροντίς, *Hom. Il.* I. 243, σὺ δ' ἐνδοθι θυμὸν ἀμύξεις.

#### *Supplices* 819-21 :

λύσιμα μάχιμα δ' ἐπίδε, πάτερ,  
βίαια μὴ φιλεῖς ὀρῶν  
δμῶσιν ἐνδικοῖς.

*μὴ φιλεῖς* is ungrammatical, and is answered by *δίζηνται* in the antistrophe. *φαιδρῶς*, Oberdick; *φαιδροῖς*, Weil. A better sense would perhaps be given by *ψιλοῖς*, 'but look for deliverance in fighting, father, and do not regard deeds of violence with mere accusing eyes.' The sense 'without resort to arms' is implied in *ψιλοῖς*.

#### *Prometheus* 415-7 :

δακρυσιότακτον δ' ἀπ' ὅσων  
ραδινῶν λειβομένα βέος παρεῖαν  
νοτίους ἔτεγγε πηγαῖς.

The first verse is Ionic a minore in the antistrophe. There is an erasure after *νοτίοις* in the MS. We might therefore remove δ' (Heath), joining *λειβομένα* with *στένω* above, and read *νοτίοις τ'*. But what construction has *παρειάν*, or rather *ρέος*, for the Greeks said *λείβειν* *ρέος*, but *λείβεσθαι* *ρεύματι* *παρειάν*? Eur. *Andr.* 532 *λείβομαι* *δακρύοις* *κόρας*, 'my eyes are suffused with tears.' Schol. *παρὰ τὸ ρέω ρέος ὡς κλέπτω κλέπος*. But everyone knows that *ρέος* is from *ρέω*, and the parallel of *κλέπτω κλέπος* is less simple. Read *παρὰ τὸ ρέζω ρέθος*, which makes the parallel more relevant. *Orion*, p. 129, *ρέζει γὰρ τὸ βάψαι*. 'Επίχαρμος 'Οδυσσεΐ. 'Ἀλλὰ καὶ ρέζει τι χρώμα,' ἀντὶ τοῦ βάπτει. *Etym. Mag.* p. 703, *ρέζει γὰρ τὸ βάψαι, καὶ οἶον μεταποιῆσαι*. So *inficere* for *tingere*. *ρέθος* is the tincture or complexion of the face, *προσώπου ἐρύθημα*, as it is often explained in the lexicons. We might therefore replace a letter in the text, reading *λειβομένα* *ρέθος* *παρειάν*, 'with tears distilled from my sluicing eyes suffusing the complexion of my cheeks.' When *ρέος* was written, the conjunction was shifted to bring *παρειάν* under the government of *ἐτεγξα*. Compare *Soph. Ant.* 528-30, *νεφέλη δ' ὀφρύων ὑπὲρ αἵματόεν ρέθος αἰσχύνει, τέγγουσ' εὐώπα παρειάν*, 'a cloud over her brow makes havoc of her flushed complexion, by soaking her beauteous cheek.' Schol. *αἵματόεν ρέθος* · τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ προσώπῳ ἐρύθημα. In the antistrophe to these verses there is a gap, which we might perhaps fill up as follows:

μεγαλοσχήμενά τ' ἄρχαι-  
οπρεπῇ (Κιμμέριοι) στένουσι τὰν σὰν  
ξυνομαιμόνων τε τιμάν.

The Chorus go on to mention the Asiatic colonists, the Amazons, the Scythians, and an Arab offshoot near Caucasus as sympathising with the sorrows of Prometheus. On the first of these the scholiast observes *ἀναχρονισμός* · οὐπὼ γὰρ ἦν ἐποικισθεῖσα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἡ Ἀσία. The Cimmerians, a nation old enough to be named in Homer, would not so readily invite this objection, but coming first in the list they might be the first to suffer from a mistaken attempt to remove it. Their name recurs in close connection

with the Amazons at 756; their home was about the lake Maeotis, near enough the scene of Prometheus' torment; and, being an ancient people themselves, they would naturally lament the downfall of an ancient dynasty.

#### *Prometheus 703-6:*

ἦσαν πρὸς εὐποτον τε Κερχελας ρέος  
Λέρνης ἄκρην τε· βουκόλος δὲ γηγενὴς  
ἄκρατος ὀργὴν Ἄργος ὠμάρτει πυκνοῖς  
δοσοῖς δεδορκίως τοὺς ἐμούς κατὰ στίβους.

Lerna was a low-lying marsh, whereas ἄκρα is a headland or height. The Ionic vowel of ἄκρην is suspicious, and ἄκρην τε Λέρνης appears the natural order. Λέρνης τε κρήνην, Canter; ἀκτὴν τε Λέρνης, Blomfield; Λέρνης τ' ἐς ἀκτὴν, Reisig. I rather suspect that ἄκρην has arisen from ἄκρατος below, and has supplanted a longer word after Λέρνης. It appears to me that εὐποτον was opposed by ΓΕ (not ΤΕ) to ἄκρατος, and that when the particle was miswritten room had to be found for an answering τε. Read εὐποτόν γε Κερχελας ρέος, Λέρνης τιθήνην, 'I rushed to the rivulet of Cerchneia, so cool and clear to drink, the nurse of Lerna; but still the herdsman Argus with hot untempered rage would dog my steps,' etc. τιθήνη, as the source of supply to the marsh, reminds us of Αἴτνα χιόνος τιθήνα.

AUSTIN SMYTH.

#### AESCHYLUS, CHOEPHORI 296.

κακῶς ταριχευθέντα παμφθάρτωι μύρῳ.

THE meaning of *ταριχευθέντα*, imperfectly seen by most scholars, has been proved by Mr. J. C. Lawson in his *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, pp. 421 ff. and 455 ff. It is 'preserved from corruption,' 'damned to incorruption.' The parallel passages in the *Eumenides* show that the body is to be preserved, not dissolved:

ἀτμῷ κατισχνάλουσα *Eum.* 138: καὶ ζῶντά σ' ἰσχνάνασα 267, ὅμως . . . αὐοῖα βροτοῖς 332 (ὁ ξηραίνων τοὺς βροτούς Schol).

Mr. Lawson finally explains the whole line (p. 457) 'damned to incorruption even in that doom which wastes all else': 'plane exitiosus,' Steph. That is the only way in which he can save the epithet *παμφθάρτωι* from being otiose; but 'else' is not in the Greek; and the sense which we require is the opposite: 'by a doom of incorruption,' a sense which can be obtained without the change of a single letter thus:

κακῶς ταριχευθέντ' ἀπαμφθάρτω μύρῳ.

Now it may be objected that Greek, when it wishes to negative totality, does so in the order παν-α-, not α-παν-, as παν-ἀ-φθίτος, παν-α-πῆμων, παν-α-φ-ῆλιξ. Yes, certainly; if the meaning be 'totally immortal,' 'totally free from sorrow.' But the meaning in this passage is different; it is 'not totally destroyed,' like Tennyson's 'not all-unhappy'; that is, 'partly preserved,' 'partly happy but partly unhappy': for the process of ταριχευσις, as Dr. Leaf has observed on H 85, is that of 'partial mummification,' that is, 'partial preservation.'

In short, the words in our line have been wrongly divided; and when we have restored ἀπαμφθάρτος to the Lexicon, it will follow that ἀπαμφθάρτος, which exists on the sole authority of this passage, must disappear from it.

J. U. POWELL.

### AESCHYLUS, AGAMEMNON.

286 ff. ὑπερτελής τε, πόντον ὥστε νωτίσαι  
ισχύς πορευτοῦ λαμπάδος πρὸς ἡδονήν  
πεύκη τὴ χρυσοφεγγής, ὥς τις ἥλιος,  
σέλας παραγγείλασα Μακίστου σκοπαίς.

THE verb required in place of the corrupt πεύκη is ἐπέυκτο. The tense of παραγγείλασα is then explained as no other suggested correction has explained it; and χρυσοφεγγής σέλας is better without the article preceding it. The form ἐπέυκτο does not occur elsewhere, but the simple form εὔκτο is cited from the *Thebais* (Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 42). The resulting passage appears to me strikingly Aeschylean:

'And towering high to bridge the sea's broad span,  
The giant courier-blaze made joyful boast  
That ne'er had sun shot message-beam more bright  
With golden glory to Makistus' towers.'

717 ff. ἔθρεψεν δὲ λέοντος ἱ-  
νιν δόμοις ἀγάλακτον οὐ-  
τως ἀνήρ φιλόμαστον κ.τ.λ.

Conington's correction of λέοντα σίνιν το λέοντος ἱνιν is incomplete: the unsatisfactory words ἀγάλακτον οὕτως conceal the epithet of λέοντος, namely ἀγελακτόνου, and the remaining letters τως should be restored as τέως. The adjective ἀγελακτόνος, though not found, is correct in form, and has special point here as anticipating the phrase μηλοφόνουσι σὺν ἄταις, the respect in which the whelp subsequently displayed ἦθος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων. The adverb τέως, repeated and defined by ἐν βίῳ πρὸς τοτελείῳς, anticipates and contrasts with χρονισθεῖς δὲ at the opening of the antistrophe.

1169 ff. ἄκος δ'  
οὐδὲν ἐπήρεσαν  
τὸ μὴ πόλιν μὲν ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχειν παθεῖν,  
ἐγὼ δὲ θερμύνουσιν τάχ' ἐμπέδω βαλῶ.

The MSS. vary between ἔχειν and ἔχει, but ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχει παθεῖν is not tolerable Greek,

idiom demanding ἔχειν ὥσπερ ἔχει or παθεῖν ὥσπερ (or ἄπειρ) ἔπαθε. The *lectio difficilior* ἔχειν conceals the first corruption in these two lines: it should be ἔχρων—'those sacrifices availed not to save my country from suffering even as I kept foretelling'—and provides the clue to the thought of the next line,

ἐγὼ δ' ἔθ' ὁρμαίνουσά γ' ἐμπέδω ματῶ.

('And I, whose vision still is sure, still warn in vain.')

With this reading there is a pathetic corroboration of Cassandra's plaint in the reply of the Chorus, who, while acknowledging the inspired source of her dismal prophecies, conclude the whole passage with τέρμα δ' ἀμυχανῶ.

J. C. LAWSON.

### EMENDATIONS OF XENOPHON'S HELLENICA.

#### II. iii. 56.

οὐκ ἀγνοῶ ὅτι ταῦτα ἀποφθέγματα οὐκ ἀξιόλογα.

THIS could only mean 'these things are trifling anecdotes,' but we evidently expect 'such anecdotes are trifling,' τοιαῦτα, which is better than ταῦτα <τὰ>, or at least more logical.

#### II. iv. 13:

καὶ τοὺς φιλάτους τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀπεσημαίνοντο.

No Greek would ever say τοὺς φιλάτους τῶν ἡμετέρων, nor can ἀπεσημαίνοντο mean 'proscribe,' but is regularly used of confiscating goods. Portus in a blundering way suggested τὰ φίλτατα, as if anybody would say τὰ φίλτατα τῶν ἡμετέρων for τὰ τιμιώτατα; but it is to his credit that he saw the text to be impossible. Read τοὺς φιλάτους <ὑβρίζον καὶ> τὰ ἡμέτερα: we can so account for the corruption better than Portus does, since when the gap had been made τὰ ἡμέτερα was obviously wrong and the next scribe accordingly corrupted it, and everybody knows that any words may drop out anywhere, but that τοὺς φιλάτους is a very unlikely corruption of τὰ φίλτατα unless some cause can be shown for it. Wytttenbach, proposing τὰ ἡμέτερα ἀπεσημαίνοντο καὶ τοὺς φιλάτους ἀπέκτεινον, gets much the same sense as I do but at greater expense, and ἀπέκτεινον is plainly the wrong idea. II. iii. 21, αὐτοὺς μὲν ἀποκτείνειν τὰ δὲ χρήματα αὐτῶν ἀποσημῆσθαι: precisely; the thirty killed the men αὐτοὺς, but οἱ φίλτατοι would



be the objects of ὕβρις. Thuc. VII. 68, ἀνδράσι μὲν ἂν τάλγιστα προσέθεσαν παισὶ δὲ καὶ γυναιξὶ τὰ ἀπρεπέστατα.

I fancy that a good many words and phrases have dropped out from the text of the *Hellenica*; another instance seems pretty clear in this same chapter, 26, where read χαλεπῶς φερόντων <τῶν> ἱππέων.

### III. iii. 5:

οὗτος δ' ἦν καὶ τὸ εἶδος νεανικός (so Naber for νεανίσκος) καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν εὐρωστος.

But how can a man be νεανικός in appearance? Or if he might be said to look νεανικός when he was really older, what possible object could Xenophon have in putting in so irrelevant a remark? I think that εἶδος is a corruption of ἥθος, which may have first become ἦδος, as ἥθη became ἦδη in Theognis 667, and was then naturally changed to εἶδος. It is an obvious objection that ἥθος and ψυχὴ do not give a sufficient antithesis, but I think they do: 'he was spirited in character, resolute in will' (L. and S. s.v. ψυχὴ II. 3, and cf. εἰψυχος). If the antithesis were between appearance and mind, the word used would be σῶμα, not εἶδος. Cf. Plato, *Symp.* 195 E, ἐν ἡῇσιν καὶ ψυχαῖς.

### IV. i. 39:

ὁ δὲ δεξιμένος, φάλαρα ἔχοντας περὶ τῷ ἵππῳ Ἰδαίου τοῦ γραφέως πάγκαλα, περιελὼν ἀντίδωκεν αὐτῷ.

This clumsy sentence has to mean that Agesilaus took away the trappings of the horse of Idaeus and gave them to the son of Pharnabazus as a return present. A cheap way of being generous! And what was 'Idaeus the painter' doing in the suite of the general, and why were his φάλαρα so beautiful? Was it because he had painted them himself? Yes, but they were not his own. Xenophon wrote ἔχων. Agesilaus had fine trappings on his own horse, adorned by this painter, and some sleepy scribe seeing a genitive coming along perverted ἔχων into agreement with it. Or perhaps ἔχων τὰ.

### IV. iii. 5.

οἱ μὲν Θετταλοὶ νομίσαντες οὐκ ἐν καλῷ εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς ὀπλίτας ἱππομαχεῖν.

The Thessalians had been attacking the rear of Agesilaus, the latter had therefore massed his cavalry there to

NO. CCLXXXII. VOL. XXXV.

keep them off, and the cavalry on both sides παρετάξαντο ἀλλήλοις. The Thessalians accordingly would have to fight the horse, not the foot, who had no intention of entering into battle but only desired to march on unimpeded. Read τοῖς ὀπλίταις: the Thessalians did not like engaging the enemy in the neighbourhood of the hoplites.

### IV. v. 14:

ὁ δὲ πολέμαρχος ἐκέλευσε τὰ δέκα ἀφ' ἧβης ἀποδιῶσαι τοὺς προειρημένους.

Iphicrates λαβὼν τοὺς πελταστὰς ἐπέθετο τῇ μόρᾳ. It is inconceivable that Xenophon should then immediately speak of these peltasts as τοὺς προειρημένους: of course he wrote τοὺς προσκειμένους. (προσφερομένους is perhaps also conceivable, but less good on every ground.)

### V. iii. 7:

φημὶ ἀνθρώπους παιδεύεσθαι μάλιστα μὲν οὖν . . .

Cobet deletes οὖν, and plainly it is impossible to keep it; but the sense requires ἂν with παιδεύεσθαι. For confusion of ἂν with οὖν see Bywater in *J.P.* vol. xxxii., p. 227.

### V. iv. 24:

ἔδοξεν αὐτῇ δὴ ἀδικώτατα ἐν Λακεδαίμονι δίκην κριθῆναι.

Dindorf inserts ἡ before δίκη. This would mean that the case 'was most iniquitously decided in Sparta,' where the last two words are superfluous. The sense we want is 'this was the most iniquitous decision ever made in Sparta,' i.e. ἀδικωτάτη without ἡ; or if you keep ἡ, then τῶν must be added before ἐν. The former is obviously the better remedy.

### V. iv. 58:

γενομένης δὲ τῆς κνήμης ὑπερέγκου καὶ ὀδυνῶν ἀφορήτων.

This καὶ is itself intolerable; it is only a case of μ' being misread as κ'.

### VI. iv. 32:

οἱ δὲ ἀφίκοντο τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πύλων, ἐν ταῖς πλείστας ἐτιμῶντο.

This very unsatisfactory sentence is due to somebody who did not understand the idiom ἐν τοῖς πλείστα.

### VII. iv. 37:

ὥς δὲ πολλοὶ οἱ εἰργμένοι ἦσαν, πολλοὶ δὲ κατὰ τοῦ τέλους ἐκπεπηδηκότες.

Clearly we want *μὲν* after the first πολλοὶ; clearly, too, we do not want *οἱ*. It seems then that a scribe wrote *οἱ* for *μὲν* by a species of dittographical blunder, much as Shelley wrote 'a dove chased by a dove' when he meant 'by a hawk.' (See the *Boat on the Serchio*).

ARTHUR PLATT.

#### HORACE, ODES I. VIII. 1-2.

THIS passage is one of a very few where, in preparing a new edition of Wickham's text for the *Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* in 1912, I departed from the reading which had approved itself to Wickham. In place of

Lydia, dic, per omnes

Te deos oro, Sybarin cur properes amando,

I followed Vollmer in introducing the very much better attested *hoc deos vere*. This latter is the reading of all the MSS. of what is, in my edition, called the *a* Group, and in that of Vollmer the *ⓐ* Group; and it has partial support from the *β* or *ⓑ* Group. I see no reason to depart from the principle which I laid down in my *Praefatio*, p. ix, that the *a* Group should always carry an authority much greater than that of the other stock of MSS. On the other hand, there are, as I pointed out, a number of passages where, quite certainly, the MSS. of the *a* Group have suffered interpolation, and where the truth is faithfully preserved in the *β* Group. The present passage is, as I now think, one of these. In 1912 I did not understand the origin of the variants here, and I doubt whether Vollmer did. Once their origin is perceived, the business of selecting between them is not a difficult one.

As is well known, Horace employs in this *Ode* a metre which is not illustrated by any of the extant remains of Greek lyric. Kiessling and others have supposed that he invented it. Wilamowitz, on the other hand, regards its employment by Horace as sufficient evidence that it was used by Sappho and Alcaeus (*Isyllus*, p. 133). A third view, and a very much older one, is that Horace supposed himself to be writing choriambic dimeters and tetrameters, but did not understand his metre. Until the dust of Egypt—as it may any day do—furnishes my refutation, I shall adhere to this third view. In doing so, I have the powerful support of Caesius Bassus, who was both a poet and a metrist. In the judgment of Quintilian, Bassus was the second lyric poet of Rome. He was also the author of a treatise upon metric of which a considerable fragment is preserved to us in Part I. of the *Ars* of Atilius Fortunatianus. Bassus (p. 270) begins by quoting the first two lines of our poem in the form in which they appear in the MSS. of the *β* Group—*te deos oro*, etc. 'Horace,' he proceeds, 'made only one attempt in this metre, exhibiting a laborious regularity in error which arose from his not knowing its real nature. Certainly his vagary is not a very charming one. By tampering

with one of the feet, he has produced a result which is harsh. If he had realised that he was dealing with a choriambic metre possessing a settled cadence, he would not have dropped into this rough effect. The first line is choriamb + antibacchius—*Lydia, dic per omnes*. The second, and longer, line consists of three choriamb with one antibacchius for its close. That is the pattern of the metre in Alcaeus, who had a very good knowledge of rhythmical effects. But Horace has produced a most ugly effect by making the last part of his first choriamb (in line 2) spondaic instead of iambic—*hoc deos oro* (*hoc AB; te ed. pr.: oro B (?)*). *ed. pr.: vere A*). If he had done as Alcaeus does, he would have given us the rhythm of *hoc dea vere*.'

Now in this passage Bassus begins, as I say, by quoting lines 1-2 of our poem (in full) in the form which they have in the *β* Group; nor do his MSS., nor does the *ed. pr.*, offer there any variants. The variants, therefore, which I have noted at the end of the passage are most simply explained as due to the proximity of *hoc dea vere*. Bassus starts from *te deos oro*. He pronounces that metrically faulty. In order to make plain what the true metre is he remodels the line in such a way as to exhibit the metre with the least possible alteration of words and sense. If *te dea oro* would have served his turn, he would have given us that. But having changed *deos* to *dea*, he is involved in the consequential change *vere*, or the like, for *oro*. The further substitution of *hoc* for *te* is made, not *metri gratia*, but in order to yield a couplet more or less complete in sense (the sense of *per omnes* is, it is true, a little dim). This is the regular method of the Latin metricians, exemplified elsewhere in Bassus himself by

Maecenas atavis edite remigibus.

It yields in this passage two lines—

Te deos oro, Sybarin cur properes amando

Hoc dea vere, Sybarin cur properes amando,

of which it may be said that they have fared hand in hand down the centuries of grammatical learning. They appear first in Bassus. They are reproduced in two passages of Marius Victorinus, pp. 87, 166 (=Aphthonius: and the double citation, no doubt, indicates that Aphthonius was drawing upon two distinct sources). They reappear in Atilius Fortunatianus, p. 300. Though they are not found together in Diomedes, it is clear that Diomedes, pp. 120, 128, goes back ultimately to Bassus. It was impossible that these lines should stand side by side in the metrical handbooks for centuries without the *te deos oro* of the first becoming, by assimilation with the second, *hoc deos vere*. The assimilation is already completed in Marius Victorinus, although Atilius keeps *te deos oro*. I have little doubt that it is from the metrical handbooks, in particular those which treated specially the metres of Horace, that the Horatian MSS. of the *a* Group derive their *hoc deos vere*. They derive it, that is, from a line of Bassus which is no more Horatian than 'Postquam res Asiae desine Maenali' is Vergilian.

Bassus' rather sharp criticism of Horace suggests, I may be allowed to notice, interesting speculations. Is it merely that the second lyric of Rome is not prepared to take second place *lying down*? Or is Bassus the inheritor of a metrical tradition which was at loggerheads with the school of Horace? Varro is said (by those whose scholarship is in the fashion) to have been the 'source' of Bassus. It is unlikely that Varro criticised the *Odes* of Horace: he died in 28 B.C. But he may very well have been the enemy of the Augustan school of metric. If he preferred the Sapphics of Catullus to Sapphics constructed like those of Horace, most of us will sympathise with him. If he said that the new school did not understand how to write choriambics, he said what was very likely true. For my part, I feel obliged to say that I have yet to learn what lyric metre Horace did understand. His idea of a lyric line seems to be that it shall always have what in Greek it never has, the caesura characteristic of spoken or recited verse. If that was a principle of the new school, I can quite believe that Varro criticised it. It would be interesting to have a little more of this Varroian criticism: particularly if it came to us in Latin as good as that of Caesius Bassus.

H. W. GARROD.

#### HORACE, *EPP.* 1. 2. 30, 31.

Cui pulcrum fuit in medios dormire dies et  
Ad strepitum citharae cessatum ducere curam.

A TOO familiar crux, on which the last word has probably been spoken long ago. And yet while I was reading the *Epistles* this morning after many years, there flashed upon me what I believe to be the truth.

*Cessatum ducere curam* is possible Latin; but the sons of Alcinoüs had no cares. *Curam* may have come in from *curanda* in 29.

The v. l. *somnum*, old as it is, is not only impossible but ridiculous. The Phaeacians were not dormice; they stayed awake to hear Odysseus, and are represented as leading a jolly life. Horace means to tell us that they turned day into night and night into day. Besides, nobody would order a *strepitus* to help him to go to sleep! So far from sleeping, they were dancing; compare *Ep.* 1. 14. 26.

What is the word displaced by *curam* and *somnum*? I am convinced that the word is *noctem*, which is almost required to balance *dies* in 30.

Bentley's *cessantem* is probably right. Compare *Ep.* 1. 15. 6, where, as here, it means not 'slow to come' but 'slow to go.' Or, quite possibly, it means 'an idle night': the word is a favourite with Horace.

W. R. INGE.

#### VIRGIL'S 'ECLOGUES': A METRICAL CLUE TO THE ORDER OF COMPOSITION.

In an interesting article on 'A Metrical Peculiarity of the *Culex*' (*Classical Review*, Vol. XXXIII., August-September, 1919, pp. 95-7), Dr.

Warde Fowler calls attention to a characteristically Lucretian rhythm, in which the fifth foot of the hexameter commences with a monosyllabic word, whether or not preceded by a distinct pause. His arguments appear to prove that, with the gradual maturing of his artistic instinct, Virgil tended more and more to avoid this normally awkward movement. Consequently it may be of value to apply the metrical test to the disputed question of the order in which the *Eclogues* were composed. An examination of these yields the following undoubted instances: *Ecl.* I. none; II. 25, 37, 42, 53, 60; III. 1, 23, 40, 52, 88, 94; IV. 34, 56; V. 52, 80, 87 (quot. of III. 1); VI. 9, 80; VII. 21, 47; VIII. 7, 49 and 51 (cf. *Culex* 292), 103 (cf. II. 26); IX. 17, 33, 53, 60; X. 11 (cf. Theoc. I. 67).<sup>1</sup> Of these cases all but twelve are preceded by a distinct pause ('Bucolic Diaeresis'). The frequency of the rhythm in each poem can be indicated by the ratio, respectively, of the number of cases to the total number of lines, and the *Eclogues* can then be arranged in a diminishing series, which *ex hypothesi* should roughly correspond with the chronological order: II. (1/14.6), IX. (1/16.75), III. (1/18.5), VIII. (1/27.5), V. (1/30), IV. (1/31.5), VII. (1/35), VI. (1/43), X. (1/77), I. (no case).<sup>2</sup>

This computation is open to question. The characteristic feature of the rhythm, giving it a somewhat harsh effect, is the conflict of metrical ictus and word accent (e.g. *non égo Daphnim*, II. 26). This is absent in ten of the instances (II. 53, 60; III. 88; V. 52, 80; VI. 9; VIII. 49 and 51; IX. 33, 53), where we have the monosyllable followed by *quoque*, a word which has

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of cases with enclitic *que* (I. 14, III. 68, VI. 21, VIII. 34, IX. 59), the last of which at least is counted by Dr. Warde Fowler. These are not pure instances, and the absence of a conflict of word accent and ictus has the effect of softening the harshness of the rhythm. The two cases of the elision of a dissyllabic word (VII. 7, IX. 51) are very doubtfully to be reckoned. If admitted, they would give an earlier position to VII. and IX.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. with the average ratio for the *Eclogues* (1/32.65)—*Culex* (1/20.7), Lucretius Bk. I. (1/34.87), *Georgics* (1/100.16), *Ciris* (1/108), Catullus LXIV. (1/204), *Aeneid* I.-VI. (1/135.8), on the same basis of calculation.

the value of an unstressed enclitic, throwing its accent back upon the monosyllable. Thus it may be advisable to omit these cases,<sup>1</sup> as, on different grounds, V. 87 and X. 11, the former as a quotation, the latter as a repetition of *nam néque* at the beginning of the line in conscious imitation of the original (*ἡ κατὰ Πηνειῷ καλὰ τέμπεα; ἡ κατὰ Πίνδω;*). On this revised basis of calculation we obtain as the order—III. (1/22·2), II. (1/24·3), IV. (1/31·5), IX. (1/33·5), VII. (1/35), VIII. (1/55), VI. (1/86), V., X., I. (no cases).<sup>2</sup>

Such a result may possibly be a matter of pure accident; but we must bear in mind the consciousness of Virgil's art, and the likelihood that he bestowed special care on his line endings. Consequently it appears that we have here, without laying undue stress on a test with so slender a basis, some indication of earliness or lateness in the case of poems at either end of the scale. We cannot of course rely on it to give us a much more accurate determination of order, as a poet's practice does not necessarily vary in a strict mathematical sense, and a poem's relative position would be considerably affected by the presence of one or two instances more or less.

It is with reference to the relative position of IX. and I. that this evidence seems chiefly valuable, and it is remarkable how the rest harmonise, whichever calculation we accept, with the place accorded them on other grounds, internal and external. Most authorities agree with placing II. and III. early and VI. and X. correspondingly late. X. (professedly the last: cf. l. 1) is perhaps fixed (l. 47) by Agrippa's expedition in 37 B.C., while the subject-matter of VI. transcends that of the pure pastoral. IV. seems definitely fixed by Pollio's consulship to 40 B.C. (middle of period), and VIII. by its preface to 39 B.C. The rough consistency of the order here obtained with the conclusions

from these and many other data lends some countenance to the view that the test is also right in assigning to IX. an earlier date than to I.

The tradition that Virgil, on the advice and through the advocacy of Pollio, obtained from Octavian himself at Rome the restitution of his farm, and that subsequently, owing to the change in the governorship of Transpadane Gaul, he found himself dispossessed, and barely escaped with his life, gives the suggestion of an attempt to account for events on the assumption that I. preceded IX. From this test it would appear that the truth was actually the reverse, though of course the question would have to be decided by other methods of proof. It is not in itself an unreasonable assumption that I. was written late, and prefixed as a preface to the whole collection in honour of the man whose supremacy was then acknowledged in the West (circa 37 B.C.), and to whom the poet owed a special debt of gratitude, whether or not, at the date of composition, the restoration of his lands was an accomplished fact.

An application of the same metrical test gives the following proportions in the several books of the *Georgics*<sup>3</sup>: I. 1/128·5, II. 1/67·75, III. 1/62·9, IV. 1/141·5. The average (1/100·16) is well below that of the *Eclogues*, and the number of instances is proportionately so small that it is doubtful if anything could be based on it. It should, however, be noted: (1) That the greater number of instances occur in II. and III., the more Lucretian and didactic books; (2) that they tend to occur in groups, these being usually typically Lucretian passages; while (3) in at least five cases (II. 82, 308, 321, 486; IV. 498) the rhythm is used with conscious purpose and effect.

ALEXANDER J. D. PORTEOUS.

#### MARTIAL IX. 21.

THIS is an epigram of similar argument to XII. 16 (cf. X. 31); property has been realised to find the means for

<sup>1</sup> As an example of the difference cf. the smoothness of *crudelis tū quoque mater* of VIII. 49 and 51 with the original *crudelis tū magis Ōrphēu* (*Culex* 292).

<sup>2</sup> There appears to be a real anomaly here in the position of V., which is generally placed soon after II. and III. (ll. 86-7).

<sup>3</sup> The cases are: I. 29, 150, 356, 380; II. 20, 49, 82, 308, 321, 447, 458, 486; III. 8, 35, 42, 84, 176, 260, 416, 496, 499; IV. 84, 324, 418, 498.



amusements. In this case there has been less of a sale than an exchange—Calliodorus has given Artemidorus a slave-boy in return for an estate.

There is little point in the last line. 'Which of them scored? *Artemidorus amat, Calliodorus arat.*' Is not *amat* a correction by an over-ingenious copyist of an *arat* in the first half of the line also ('both are ploughmen now'), the word being used literally the second time and in *malam partem* the first time? Cf. Plautus *Truculentus* 150 'qui arari solent ad pueros ire meliu'st.'

S. GASELEE.

#### ΠΕΠΙΑΚΤΟΙ (ΘΥΡΑΙ).

In *Georgics* III. 24, 'vel scaena ut versis discedat frontibus,' what does Vergil mean by *discedere*? Surely he means 'open,' just as the earth opens in an earthquake (Cic. *De off.* III. 9, 'cum terra *discessisset* magnis quibusdam imbribus'), or the sky seems to open (Cic. *De Div.* I. 43, 97, 'cum caelum *discessione* visum est atque in eo animadversi globi'). 'The back-scene opens with a change of front,' by which the side previously hidden from the view of the audience becomes visible and *vice versa*. (Servius did not understand *discedat*, and so introduced the irrelevant remark about *scaena ductilis*.) Obviously there must have been a Greek expression for this arrangement: I suggest *πεπιακτοὶ θύραι*, doors revolving on a centre. This supports Professor Exon's view (*Hermathena* XI. 1901, p. 132), and explains the Scholion on *Eumenides* 64. In the next edition of Professor Flickinger's *Greek Theater and its Drama* he might well alter the note on p. 298 (in which the conventional interpretation of Vitruvius is given), and boldly label the arrangement, lucidly explained on p. 285 and shown in Fig. 74, as *πεπιακτοὶ*. We may then without hesitation apply the term to the fifth-century Attic stage.

I submit (a) that Plutarch (*Mor.* 348E) does not necessarily imply that *μυχανή* is the substantive to be supplied, and that Vitruvius (V. 6. 8) is rather against it; (b) that as more doors were pierced in the back scene, the triangular arrangement came to be introduced, and *tableaux* were no longer exhibited in the manner of the fifth century. Now, we can give its full value to Vitruvius' statement (VII. *Praef.* 10), 'namque primum Agatharchus Athenis, Aeschylus docente tragoediam, scenam fecit.' The two surfaces of canvas or wood supplied a

large area for scene-painting. It may well be that Agatharchus first produced something of the sort for the *Oresteia*, the last production of Aeschylus on the Athenian stage, and went on improving his work of collaboration with Sophocles between 458 and 441, the date of the production of the *Antigone*. This would explain Aristotle's attribution of *σκηνογραφία* to Sophocles (*Poetics*, 1449a 18).

G. C. RICHARDS.

#### ETRUSCAN INSCRIPTIONS.

HAPPENING to visit the public museum at Exeter, I found an Etruscan inscription there which appears to be unpublished. It is on a patera of *bucchero* ware. The part which runs round the rim reads:

*Θανιασεῖαντι : tutnaśecherīnisa : ś.*

As the circle of letters is complete, the last *ś* might be intended to stand before *Θania*. It appears to be the initial of *śuθina*, a derivative of *śuθi* 'tomb,' often inscribed upon objects intended to be buried with the deceased. *tutna* is for *tutnal*, and the translation is: 'Thania Seianti: Tutnai's daughter, Herini's wife: for her tomb.'

It happens that this lady's epitaph is extant as follows:

*Θania : seianti : tutnal : śec : herinisa*

(Fabretti, *Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum*, 705, and Paulli, *Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum*, 2757): it was found near Chiusi.

The second part of the inscription at Exeter is written across the face of the patera:

*atehctnet*

I believe that the first three letters are a complete word equivalent to *viduus* (cp. *atiu* 'a widow'), and that the fourth is the initial of *herini*, the husband's name. Other abbreviations follow, I think.

The whole inscription was produced with a stylus or similar instrument, and the reading is quite certain. The writing is throughout retrograde.

W. MADELEY.

## REVIEWS

## GRECO-ROMAN AND ARABIC BRONZE INSTRUMENTS AND THEIR MEDICO-SURGICAL USE.

*Greco-Roman and Arabic Bronze Instruments and their Medico-Surgical Use.* By S. HOLTH, M.D. Pp. 19, four plates, and five figures in text. Christiania, 1919. (Written in English.)

WE are wont to reflect upon the prodigious advance that would have been made by the Greeks had they but possessed adequate instruments for discovery. Well, this is not quite so simple a proposition as it looks. Instruments are both cause and consequence of discovery. The term A in a series enables the artificer to make a certain instrument which carries the observer on to term B. But term A was itself the apex of a cone of previous causes. Thus the experimental method engenders its own instruments. The Ionians had not time enough to develop more than the simplest scientific instruments, nor to train competent artificers; later, in Alexandria, many valuable instruments were manufactured, but step by step, as discovery originated them, and as more time and more settled institutions favoured their production.

In Hippocratic times surgical instruments were designed and used more efficiently than we commonly suppose. The period culminating in Hippocrates must have been far longer than is generally realised. We are apt to speak of Hippocrates as an insurgent genius springing as it were full-grown out of the brain of a rudimentary age. A genius he was no doubt, but must also have been the child of a long period of medical practice, and ripe experience, of which we know nothing, literally nothing! But strong men lived before Hippocrates: the surgery of the fifth century, and such masterly treatises as *The Aphorisms*, *Ancient Medicine*, *First and Third Epidemics*, *Airs, Waters and Places*, *On the Joints*, and *On Fractures*, must assuredly have been the outcome of a long gestation of earlier tradition and experience. We may speak of that time as the lost school: medically pre-

historic. And yet it must have had some written documents and records, at any rate in its later time, and some implements.

Here the excavator may bring a little light to the literary student. By an unearthing of ancient surgical instruments the lost prehistoric school may yet be revealed more or less. There is no reason why bronze surgical instruments of pre-Hippocratic age should not be found, but so far as I know none of those yet discovered can claim any such antiquity; at any rate so far as Aegean civilisation is concerned. Mr. Thompson also, the courteous curator of the Wellcome Museum, tells me that no pre-Hippocratic surgical instruments have been found. He describes an engraving on marble of a forceps, a scalpel, and cupping vessels which may date from 100 B.C., but none exists that can be definitely dated as before our era.

Howbeit our present business is with Dr. Holth's Essay on a certain collection of surgical instruments of Greco-Roman and Arabian origin, found chiefly in Syria and Palestine between 1872 and 1890 by Baron Ustinov. Some came from Ascalon, others from Gaza, Caesarea, and Palmyra. All these are, of course, far from pre-Hippocratic. As most of the instruments from Greek to Byzantine times were of the same general forms, identification of period must be chiefly by incidental characters and circumstances. Concerning a certain spatula, Dr. Holth says that it is made of brass. Though metallic zinc was unknown to the early Mediterranean peoples, yet they did make brass, by melting copper ores with calamine stone—a zinc ore. A few of the Pompeian scalpel handles are also of brass (25 per cent. zinc, 75 per cent. copper). According to Mommsen (quoted Holth), the zinc bronzes came up during the Roman Empire. But the workmanship of this spatula is of later date. The decoration of some of these spatulas has rather an

Oriental than a Greco-Roman character. Silver also was used in Greco-Roman times for surgical instruments, and even gold; but these ornaments were evidently for very fashionable doctors. Instruments of steel—for no doubt fine steel was made with charcoal and the richest iron ores, then more accessible—have in great part perished by oxydation; the bronzes have survived. Of these large numbers are to be found in such collections as in the Naples Museum. Mr. Wellcome's Museum in Wigmore Street contains a fine and various collection. Mr. Milne's book remains still our standard work on the subject.<sup>1</sup>

In Greco-Roman times surgical instruments were so various, effectual, and refined in workmanship as to prove that surgery had then become a very accomplished art; but illustrations of this conclusion are hardly appropriate for these pages. Of Arabian surgical instruments little is known; few specimens seem to have found their way into public collections.

Among the instruments described by Dr. Holth, I may speak of one which resembles a netter's needle, although the forks are at right angles to each other. It is said that this opposition is more convenient for winding on the thread, and was customary in ancient times. Such an instrument, in a particular collection of surgical implements, Dr. Milne thought had drifted there by chance; but, as this association has been found several times again, Dr. Holth plausibly suggests that such needles were used as handy reels or spools on which to keep sutures neatly arranged. There are two or three of these in the Wellcome Museum. Holth describes a steelyard also which he carefully examined.<sup>2</sup> On the stem of one instrument is a measure scale of transverse lines which 'signifies that a surgeon in Ascalon'—of Hellenic or Roman period?—'practically used a millimeter scale at least one millennium and a half before the invention of the metrical system.'

CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

#### THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS.

*The Agamemnon of Aeschylus.* Translated by RUSHWORTH KENNARD DAVIS. Oxford: Blackwell, 1919. 4s. 6d net.

*The Agamemnon of Aeschylus.* Translated by GILBERT MURRAY. London: Allen and Unwin, 1920.

THESE are not likely to be the last renderings of the *Agamemnon* in English verse. It is such a marvellous poem that anyone who really appreciates it feels tempted to convey his appreciation of it to those unable to read it in Greek.

Both these renderings are of course scholarly, and are agreeable to read. Professor Davis is perhaps the more conscientious translator. Professor Murray has chosen that rhymed verse which he writes with peculiar charm. Professor Davis writes in dignified blank

verse. As regards the choruses, such an essential part of the play, the form of verse adopted seems equally good in both cases.

I add a few notes on particular points:

V. 50 (Wecklein). We should, I think, adopt Headlam's admirable emendation *ὑπατηλέχεων*, 'with their nest on the hills'; for *ὑπατοὶ λεχέων* cannot mean 'above their nests.' It follows that in v. 55 *ὑπατος κ.τ.λ.* means here not 'a god on high,' but 'a god who has his sanctuary on the hill,' and whose guests (*μέτοικοι*) the vultures who nested near him are.

V. 299. Murray is quite right in adopting Ahren's emendation *ἰχθύς* for *ἰσχύς*. He should have added in a note that Aeschylus was thinking of fishing by torchlight, a form of fishing still so much practised here. The fish come up *λαμπάδος πρὸς ἡδονήν*, and you spear them—burning the water they used to

<sup>1</sup> See also Harmonic, Dr. P.: *La Chir. et la Méd. d'autrefois d'après une prem. Sér. d'Instruments* (of his own). Paris (1900), and Gurlt's *Hist. of Surgery*.

<sup>2</sup> There is such a steelyard in the Museum at Chester.

call it in Scotland when practised by salmon poachers.

V. 421. In this very difficult and corrupt passage the scholiast gives us the hint that we should seek some reference, not only to the abandoned husband, but to the members of the household who have lost their mistress. I don't understand Murray's rendering, 'And thou, thou, what art thou?' We are obliged to accept for the sake of the metre Hermann's *ἀτίμους ἀλοιδόρους*, and who can they be but Helen's handmaidens? They have, if we accept *ἀδιστα* for *ἀδιστος*, abandoned their sweetest tasks, and the *φάσμα δόξει δόμων ἀνάσσειν* is more appropriate to them than to Menelaus, who at least was still lord of his house. The important corruption lies, I think, in *σινγᾶς*.

V. 566. Here, I think, we must suppose that something is missing after *κατεψέ-καζον*. The words *ἐμπεδον σίνος ἐσθημάτων τιθέντες ἐνθρονον τρίχα* contain a very clear and quite Aeschylean characterisation of the two varieties of louse which infest men, the *Pediculus vestimenti* and the *Pediculus capitis*—if I may be allowed to quote my own rendering, 'the creeping plague that to its lair in the clothing clings and houses in the hair,' and they cannot in any way be connected with the words that precede them in our text. No one ever maintained that vermin are due to damp.

V. 647, *διπλῇ μάστιγι*. I cannot agree with Murray's note on this. It appears to me that the double scourge of war is bondage and death, the former of which

was in antiquity almost as terrible as the latter.

Vv. 965-1000. There is no question of jettisoning cargo, as both renderings suggest. We know what *σφενδύνη* means. It is a machine (a crane or derrick for loading or unloading). The advice is 'do not overload' not 'lighten your ship when in danger.' There is a good deal of difference.

V. 1077. I suggest *ἀνδρσφαγεῖον, παιδιορραντήριον*, as *πεδορρ.* does not seem to mean anything.

Vv. 1097-1098, *προτείνει δὲ χεῖρ ἐκ χερὸς ὀρεγομένα*. It is exactly the action of knitting or netting. She sees Clytaemnestra doing this before she sees the actual net, the *ἀμφίβληστρον* which played so great a part in the murder. It does not, of course, imply that the queen made the net herself.

V. 1171. Little can be made of *θερμό-νους*. I suggested *θ' αἰμόπνους* which is not a violent change and gives good sense.

V. 1448. The same applies to *εὐνῆς*. In the appendix to my own rendering I suggest *συνθνής*, the only objection to which is that the word is unknown. It is, however, a perfectly possible word, and gives excellent sense. That it is not included in lexicæ would imply only that the corruption was very early.

Mr. Davis unfortunately is dead. It is to be hoped that Mr. Murray will render the whole trilogy, or at least the *Choephorae*—a very fine play.

W. R. PATON.

#### A HISTORY OF GREEK PUBLIC FINANCE.

*Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Δημοσίας Οἰκονομίας, ἀπὸ τῶν ἡρωϊκῶν χρόνων μέχρι τῆς συστάσεως τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ βασιλείου.*  
By A. M. ANDREADES. Large 8vo.  
One volume. Pp. xii + 624. Athens: Raptanis, 1918. 18 drachmas.

THE contents of this book are not quite in accord with their title. They carry us no further than the Byzantine age, and they do not provide a complete survey of the classical period. As Professor Andreades explains in his Preface, exigencies of space compelled

him to omit the less distinctive phases of Greek finance in order that he might give adequate attention to its most characteristic types; and we are told that the deficiencies will be made up in a forthcoming separate publication. Thus we may live in hopes; but meantime we cannot help regretting some of the lacunae in the volume before us. The finances of Ptolemaic Egypt and of the temples at Delphi and Delos are not mere variations of normal πόλις finance, and as our information on these topics is unusually complete, we



may wonder that not a line of space was found for them. Again, part at least of the fifty pages which are devoted to an excellent but irrelevant bibliography of Byzantine studies in general might have been given to a survey of Roman imperial finance, some knowledge of which is indispensable to a student of Byzantine finance. Therefore we draw from the present volume the same first impressions as from an ancient Greek statue: we miss a nose and two arms.

But second impressions will show that the author is a master of his craft. Professor Andreades is thoroughly at home in the special literature on Greek finance, but he never lets his erudition spoil his sense of proportion, and he understands how to show Greek economics in their proper perspective by comparing them with those of later ages. His judgment on controversial topics is studiously sane and well balanced, and his style has the characteristic lucidity of modern Greek scholarship.

A few words of comment are required on each of his principal chapters.

(1) *The Homeric Age*.—A comparison between this age and that of the Crusades is now becoming canonical, and Professor Andreades uses it to good advantage. This analogy enables him to set off the characteristic weakness of the Homeric kings' finance, viz. its 'parasitía' or reliance on 'benevolences' and the 'fruits of victory.' But the same analogy should have saved him from describing the Homeric armies as more 'national' than those of to-day.

(2) *Sparta*.—Professor Andreades follows Aristotle and others in fastening upon φιλοχρηματία as the predominant feature in Spartan character, and exposes ruthlessly the Spartans' lack of financial patriotism. In one instance the charge is pressed too far. Though Sparta was ill-disposed to finance long wars, she was not 'always unready': more than once she half won a campaign by superior rapidity in mobilisation. The statement that the contributions required of the individual Spartans to their συσσιτία were unduly heavy also needs qualification. No doubt absen-

teeism, especially in war-time, had the effect of reducing the output of the Spartan κλήροι to an inadequate amount, but the κλήροι were probably quite large enough to provide ample subsistence for a family under any rational system of cultivation. On the Spartan pacts with Persia Professor Andreades speaks with wholesome emphasis; as he rightly observes, of all the Greeks who caded for Persian gold the Spartans were the most guilty, for they set the example to the rest.

(3) *City-State Finance in General*.—Some of the statements in this chapter invite criticism. All Englishmen, and some students of Athenian and Roman history, will quarrel with the assertion that the 'liberty of the individual' was discovered by the French Revolution. And present-day taxpayers will scarcely admit that the modern state is burdened with fewer services than the Greek πόλις. Our expenses on the score of education, health, and the maintenance of regular fighting forces would hardly figure at all in a normal Greek budget, and the outlay of ancient states on 'panis et circenses' is roughly balanced by our Poor Law expenses. But the author is eminently successful in characterising city-state finance as a whole. He shows convincingly that the economic conditions of Greek life necessitated certain fiscal virtues, and that the Greeks accordingly steered clear of mercantilist and protectionist fallacies, and refrained from cheap and easy depreciations of currency. On the other hand, they lost large sums by relying on private tax-collectors; they fought shy of direct taxation; they seldom laid up reserves; in the absence of public credit they could not meet sudden calls for money by borrowing, but had recourse to expedients which often were no better than barefaced robbery.

(4) *Athens*.—This section contains a number of valuable new points. In fixing the date of the first appearance of εἰσφορά Professor Andreades draws an apt comparison with the history of the British Income Tax. He throws fresh light on the building policy of Pericles by suggesting that the glut of labour for which this policy was a remedy was

due to demobilisation after the Persian wars. The dates of Pericles' public works, and also of his cleruchies, show that this glut did not set in till about 450 B.C. The author also withholds the conventional admiration from Demosthenes' reform of the trierarchic liturgy, pointing out that his was but a half-measure: he might have added that the reform bore very heavily on the Three Hundred, who were also liable to *προεισφορά*.

Though Professor Andreades admits that Athenian finance was superior to that of other Greek states, he quotes with approval a saying of Gladstone's that Athens was ruined by bad finance. Here he overshoots the mark, for Athens was never ruined except in the sense that she failed to set up any permanent empire, and the primary cause of this failure certainly lay in faulty policy rather than in bad finance. He also appears to overrate the magnitude of the evil wrought by the *θεωρικών* and

*μισθός*. No doubt the *θεωρικών* was sheer waste, and the recipients of *μισθός* were far too numerous; but Professor Andreades' own figures show that the swollen military budgets which Athens drew up even in times of peace required retrenchment even more urgently. Conversely the author hardly gives the Athenians enough credit for their exemplary methods of accounting, or for the success of their general financial administration in the third and second centuries, as revealed by the researches of the American scholars, Professors Ferguson and Johnson.

But carping criticisms like these cannot detract perceptibly from the value of Professor Andreades' work. His book is not only informing—most treatises on finance suffer from an excess of this virtue—but stimulating and thought-compelling; and in spite of its deficiencies it gives one of the best general descriptions of ancient Greek finance. M. CARY.

#### LES CULTES PAIENS DANS L'EMPIRE ROMAIN.

*Les Cultes Païens dans l'Empire Romain.*

Première Partie, les Provinces Latines. Tome III.—Les Cultes Indigènes Nationaux et Locaux: Afrique du Nord, Peninsule Ibérique, Gaule. By J. TOUTAIN. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920.

THE present volume of 470 pages advances a stage the great work which Dr. Toutain has in hand of surveying the pagan religions of the Roman Empire. It will be remembered that the first volume, published in 1907, dealt with the official cults and the Roman and Greco-Roman cults in the Latin provinces, while in the second, published in 1911, the author treated of the Oriental cults and their diffusion within the same limits. In this third volume Dr. Toutain, still confining himself to the Latin provinces, has begun the treatment of the indigenous cults—the native cults, that is, which existed before the period of Roman domination and lasted on into it. The first half of this volume, containing North Africa and Iberia, was published

separately in 1917. Now with the addition of Gaul it is completed, but it will require at least one more volume to finish the indigenous cults of the Latin provinces, and so, presumably, to bring to an end the first part of the work.

Dr. Toutain's is a stupendous task, and he is much to be congratulated that, in spite of all the difficulties of the war-period, he has been able to issue this substantial contribution towards its completion. The range of his inquiry is vast and the detailed investigation involved enormous. Few scholars would be competent to criticise the work in detail, and I cannot attempt to do more than indicate its plan and the kind of interest which will be found in it as a book of reference or—for it is far more than a book of reference—in a continuous reading.

The same methodical treatment of the subject is pursued to which we have become accustomed in the earlier volumes. Taking each province in turn, Dr. Toutain treats successively of the various divinities worshipped, the character of the sanctuaries, the nature

of rites and offerings, the geographical and social diffusion of the cults, and their duration under the Roman Empire. This procedure has the advantage of uniformity, but it tends to obscure a little the striking features of the individual provinces. For instance, most readers of the present volume would say that the interest in Gaul lay in the character of the barbaric and semi-anthropomorphic deities worshipped, in Africa in the strangeness of some of the rites, and in Iberia perhaps in the diffusion of the cults in different parts of the provinces. Dr. Toutain gives us little indication of this, but leaves us to work it out for ourselves. Somewhat similar is his treatment of disputed points; his caution almost amounts to timidity, as, for instance, in the interesting discussion (pp. 226 ff.) whether the symbols found in representations of the mysterious 'God of the Mallet' in Gaul are to be interpreted allegorically or realistically. No one could pronounce with such authority as Dr. Toutain himself, and it is rather tantalising when he refrains.

The outcome of this intensely methodical and cautious procedure is a certain dryness of result: the salient points are hardly brought out enough, and we miss anything of the character of a general summary to guide us in the consideration of details—perhaps this will come at the end of the new volume. Nevertheless, certain points emerge which are of great interest for the study both of the religions of the provinces and of the character of the Roman imperial rule.

In the first place the duration of these indigenous cults and their continued popularity under the Roman government is very remarkable. Apart from the suppression of such practices as that of human sacrifice, Rome seems to have preserved a complete indifference to the indigenous cults. She neither participated in them—in each case the records of Roman worshippers are negligible—nor did she molest them. Crowds of native worshippers seem to have visited the shrines, performed the rites and left their offerings, while Rome stood aside. Religious toleration and neutrality were uniformly observed.

Secondly, though in the more

Romanised parts of the provinces the native deities were often assimilated to Greco-Roman gods either in name or in representation or in both, yet they were never merged in character: they always remain distinguishable by an epithet or a symbol. Sometimes, too, the identification seems purely arbitrary—as though the worshippers just sought a Roman name for their god without much thought of appropriateness. Thus it is odd to find that the Gaulish 'Jupiter' has a wheel for his emblem, and is a solar deity in character, while their 'Apollo' has nothing to do with the sun, but is god of thermal springs and a healer. This is very unlike the systematic assimilation which the Romans made of their own deities to those of Greece, and looks again as if Romans were indifferent, and the attempted assimilation came from the side of ignorant natives.

Thirdly, no reader can fail to be struck by the extremely primitive character of some of the surviving cults. In Gaul one deity is beast-headed, representing a half-completed emergence into anthropomorphism; another is tricephalous, representing, so Dr. Toutain thinks, a syncretism of three once independent divinities. Others have strange offerings, small animals and birds in Africa, whose bones were preserved in vases, and votive axes in Gaul (possibly an early form of currency). Their sanctuaries are rarely buildings, but usually enclosures—sometimes on mountain-tops, or at the sources of rivers; not infrequently caverns, and even the flat open sides of cliffs were sacred places. All this seems to show the tenacity of popular beliefs beneath a superficial culture, and this is strongly borne out when, as in Gaul, we find these strange old deities still persisting in easily recognised forms: it is not hard to see the *Fatae* and *Matrae* (notice the barbaric forms) in the *fées* and *maries* of French folklore to-day.

There are many more generalisations the reader can make for himself, and meanwhile all students of comparative religion must be grateful to Dr. Toutain for his collection and cautious sifting of the material. It is of peculiar interest

to English readers to know that the next volume will begin with a survey of the native cults of Britain. We shall

look forward to it eagerly. Is it too much to ask that it shall be provided with a good index? C. BAILEY.

### LATE LATIN.

*Vitae Patrum*: kritische Untersuchungen über Text, Syntax und Wortschatz der spätlateinischer Vitae Patrum (B. III., V., VI., VII.) von Dr. A. H. SALONIUS. Pp. xi+456. Lund, 1920. (Acta Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis II.)

IN 1912, writing a report on Plautine literature of the five preceding years, I found that the most valuable contribution had come from a student of Late Latin, Dr. Einar Löfstedt. He rescued from 'emenders' many an anticipation by Plautus of the phrases and constructions which passed from Latin into the Romance languages. He made us see in Plautus the fountain-source of Romance idiom. To anyone interested in tracing the course of spoken Latin from 200 B.C. to 600 A.D. I would suggest that Plautus' prosody too reveals the origin of Romance forms. *Ad-illam vallem* is the precursor of Italian 'alla valle,' *meum patrem* of French 'mon père,' as is shown in detail in my (forthcoming) 'Early Latin Verse.' Who will investigate the prosody of Comedian in the light of Plautine prosody on the one hand and Romance forms on the other? Literary Latin, the artificial language of Virgil's epic or Cicero's prose, has not so much fascination as the Latin of actual speech.

Löfstedt became a professor at Lund University, where his lectures have recruited and equipped a band of researchers. Dr. Salenius, a Finn, ascribes to Löfstedt's notes on the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* the impulse to the book under review, a report on the Latinity of a collection of Lives of Saints, etc., usually called the *Vitae Patrum*, but more correctly the *Verba Seniorum*.

To give details would probably not interest readers of the *Classical Review*, for Latin scholarship in this country seems to choose by some perverse habit to make itself barren by restricting itself severely to a path which once offered

glorious prospects, but not now—the path of conjectural emendation. To thresh old straw, to re-edit and re-edit the text of Propertius and Catullus and Ovid, with no new materials and no new clue, to fill the pages of learned journals with dogmatic (and eristic) divination, that can lead to nothing but vanity and vanity's sequel—vexation of spirit. Can we wonder that so many University lecturers and school-teachers, if they publish anything at all, are content with books for schoolboys or articles which do not rise above the level of the *Times Literary Supplement*?

Anyone who read the Presidential Address to the British Academy last year will know that the International Academies contemplate a re-edition of Ducange. That will be partly a task for historians and jurists; and in the fields of history and law England can be trusted to play her part. But Latinists too will have a share. The great Latin *Thesaurus* of Germany includes the Latin of the Republic and Empire till 600 A.D. The publications of Professor Löfstedt and his pupils suggest that to Scandinavia might be allotted the collection of the vocabulary of authors of the seventh century, although the services of a Swiss, Professor Niedermann of Bâle, to our knowledge of late Latinity must not be forgotten, and the model for all such studies came from France, the late Professor Bonnet's *Grégoire de Tours*. But there is an important work for English Latinists. Ducange got the framework of his *Lexicon* from seventh (and eighth) century glossaries. He used inferior MSS. and had not the remotest idea of what these glossaries actually were or how related to each other. Correct editions of the leading glossaries, especially of the seventh century, are a necessary preliminary to a re-edition of Ducange. And this naturally falls to England. For it is England's oldest dictionary, the *Corpus Glossary* (soon to



be published by the Cambridge University Press), which gives the key to glossary compilation. And it is recent articles in the *Classical Review*, the *Classical Quarterly*, the *Journal of Philology*, etc., which have for the first time made possible the editing of glossaries in correct and intelligible form.

If I could get half a dozen more helpers I could guarantee the publication of all the leading seventh (and

eightth) century glossaries in a year or a couple of years. Will volunteers please write to me? No profound knowledge of Latin (Early or Late) is needed, but only common-sense, patience, and access to a library which contains such books as Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. But I do not wish volunteers from the 'quitter' tribe, who put their hand to the plough and then look back.

W. M. LINDSAY.

#### GIULIANO L'APOSTATO.

*Giuliano l'Apostato*. Saggio critico con le operette politiche e satiriche, tradotte e commentate. One volume. Pp. 398, with Index. By A. ROSTAGNI. Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1920. L. 28.

THIS work, which forms the twelfth volume of *Il pensiero Greco*, edited by the Brothers Bocca, of Turin, is a careful, searching, and sympathetic study of the Emperor Julian, in relation to his objects and his environment. The author has availed himself of the voluminous literature on Julian which has appeared within the last eighty years, especially Mücke, Allard, Talbot, Negri, Seeck, Bury's *Gibbon*, etc., down to Mr. Wright's translation and notes in the Loeb Library.<sup>1</sup> As the text of Hertlein is generally considered adequate, and Neumann's restoration of the *Contra Christianos* is not called in question (and, except the letters in the Mavrogordato Library, there do not seem to have been many new MS. discoveries), the author does not find it necessary to devote attention to textual criticism. His work is a good piece of literary and psychological history, based both on these works of Julian which he presents in a very readable Italian translation, and on the larger number to which, without translation, he constantly refers.

Julian's active life, as military commander and reforming administrator, in

Gaul, Constantinople, and the East, is only considered incidentally. The reader would like to know more of Signor Rostagni's opinions on this department of Julian's activities, and also, perhaps, what he thinks of Julian's attitude to the Mystery Religions, on which so much material has lately come to light, and of the philosophical sects with which the Emperor had to do (especially Neo-Pythagoreans and Neo-Cynics). But the author generally gives the impression that he knows much more of everything to do with Julian and his contemporaries than he could comprise in this volume.

The part entitled *Critical Essay on Julian as Man and Writer* constitutes about a third of the book. The second part consists of translations of the *Letter to Themistius*, the *Letter to the Athenians*, the *Caesars*, the *Misopogon*, and the writings *Against the Christians*. There follows an Appendix containing an interesting discussion of the influence of Mardonius on Julian (whose mutual intercourse Rostagni would extend over a longer period than that commonly assigned), and an inquiry into the date of the *Letter to Themistius*. This last point is of importance to the author's view of Julian and his development. Themistius had exhorted Julian to accept the rôle of a philosopher-king; Julian felt unequal to the part, and preferred to abide by philosophy. This was, Rostagni thinks, in 335, in the early days of Julian's Caesarship in Gaul. Before the second possible occasion, that is 361, after the soldiers had proclaimed Julian Imperator, he had felt that for him the die was cast,

<sup>1</sup> He corrects what he considers an error due to false punctuation by which Mr. Wright would make Oribasius rather than Euhemerus Julian's librarian in Gaul (*Letter to Athenians*, 277). But the point, even after reference to Eunapius, *Maximus* 96, is not entirely clear.

and that he was under a divine mandate to restore the ancient piety. The author considers that fundamentally Julian was a theorist, not a man of action.<sup>1</sup> In fact, he would seem to endorse Strauss's verdict on Julian (though he does not quote it) as a *Romantiker auf dem Throne der Cäsaren*. This seems hardly fair. Julian's last campaign was a failure, his attempt to restore polytheism a yet more evident one; yet his work in Gaul seems to have been effectual for some time, he had plans but not time to do much in Constantinople, and even his policy in identifying religious offices with humane obligations may have had some after-effect.

Julian's age, as Rostagni shows, was one in which the higher culture was dissociated from practical life. As he would put it, Art (including letters) and Science (or serious investigation of truth) were at variance. This Julian could not see. He would have forbidden Christians to teach Homer and the other classics, because he did

not realise that neither to pagan nor to Christian scholars did ancient literature supply principles for thought and life. To the adherents alike of the old and of the new religion, the classical writings were esteemed for their wording and general form, not for their intellectual and moral worth. This amounts to saying that the time was one of decadence, and in such a time, Rostagni says, there is only one form of living literary art—the satire. This art was effectively practised by Julian himself and by his bitterest opponent—Gregory Nazianzen. Of Julian's works selected for translation two are satires—*The Misopogon* and *The Caesars*. Most modern readers would prefer the latter, and find the coarseness of the former repulsive in spite of the impressive story of the would-be magnificent festival, at which the Emperor found in attendance only one priest with one goose. Whether satire belongs specially to times of decadence is a disputable point. But the suggestion is worth consideration.

ALICE GARDNER.

<sup>1</sup> *Non aveva il genio del uomo politico.*

#### ZAGREUS, STUDI SULL' ORFISMO.

*Zagreus, Studi sull' Orfismo.* By VITTORIO MACCHIORO. Pp. 269. Bari (Laterza e figli). 1920.

THE first two studies contained in this volume consist of a discussion of the remarkable series of frescoes discovered in the 'Villa Item' at Pompeii in 1909, and first published by de Petra in the following year in *Notizie dei Scavi*, p. 139 ff. The series was fully discussed by Miss P. B. Mudie Cooke in the *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. III. (1913), where there is a much better outline reproduction of the frescoes than that given by Signor Macchioro, as well as photographs of some of the scenes. Signor Macchioro divides some of the scenes somewhat differently from his predecessors, and interprets them as representing the successive stages of one ritual performance; but in most points his exposition is not very different from that of Miss Cooke. He regards, however, the room in which they were

found, not as a triclinium, but as a 'hall of initiation,' and the whole building in which they were found as a private Orphic *bakcheion*; the ritual represented in the scenes is that which was performed in the hall—a secret ritual performed by women in daylight, like the Bacchanalia described by Livy (XXXIX. 13). Space does not allow a detailed discussion of the interpretation offered, but though it can hardly be doubted that the ritual is that of a Dionysiac initiation, the author is least convincing when he tries to connect it specifically with the worship of Zagreus. The scene which presents, as Miss Cooke says, 'a group of women engaged in a libation or lustration,' can hardly be, as the author thinks, a common feast or *agapé*, and it is scarcely legitimate to transfer the name *agapé* from Christian to Dionysiac worship. Still less is there any suggestion of such a sacramental feast as that of the Zagreus-mysteries. In the scene which

succeeds this, the author sees (among other figures) a female satyr giving the breast to the fawn; he interprets the fawn as representing the infant Dionysus, and so the 'new-born' neophyte, identified with the God; and he refers to the Orphic formula *ἔριφος ἐς γάλα ἔπετον*: but even if his reading of the scene is correct (and it seems doubtful) the Orphic formula cannot refer to feeding at the breast. The old satyr who is present is interpreted as Silenus, the priest and educator of the infant God. (It does not seem to be quite certain that he really belongs to this scene.) In connexion with the next scene, which the author, like Miss Cooke, regards a scene of *λεκανομαντεία* (and this seems certain), he lays stress on the importance of the concave or distorting mirror (here used for divination) as one of the objects by which the infant Zagreus was lured to destruction, and as, in consequence, a symbol of the passion of the God, whose significance was as unmistakable for Orphics as that of the Cross for Christians. Here (as in some other places) his point seems to be insufficiently supported by evidence. Indeed, he does not convince us that the scenes have anything to do with Zagreus or with Orphism at all. The whole subject of Orphism and of Zagreus-worship seems to need a fresh study, in which the evidence which refers to Zagreus expressly is carefully distinguished from that which refers to Dionysus *simpliciter*, and that which has certainly a reference to Orphic rites or beliefs from that which is only conjectured to do so; and above all we need a very critical treatment of such late writers as Hippolytus, Firmicus Maternus, and Nonnus, if they are to be used as evidence of the content of 'Orphism,' or of the character of Dionysiac and other mystic rites in times long before they themselves wrote. The volume before us, though full of interesting suggestions, does not appear to be sufficiently critical in these respects.

The first two studies contain interesting discussions of other mystic 'properties' besides the mirror—e.g. of the plinth or oblong block (sometimes two or more) on which so many of the figures stand or sit in this and other re-

presentations of ritual (though the explanation of this by the *ἀγέλαστος πέτρα* seems almost wild); of the *sindon* or mystic robe, the cap worn by some of the officiants, and the dark stripe on the edge of the robe; as well as of a number of ritual acts.

The third study is mainly devoted to a discussion of the psychological character of mysticism, ancient and modern, but contains little that is not familiar to anthropologically-minded scholars. Stress is laid on the 'reality' of the experience undergone by the initiated—the substitution of one personality for another (as in a hypnotic trance), which constitutes the identification with the God, and the birth into a new life. Into the metaphysical problem raised by such 'reality' this is fortunately not the place to enter.

The last study begins by an attempt to connect the ritual of the frescoes with that of the Lesser Mysteries at Agrae, but the arguments used are very inconclusive. In particular the proofs that Zagreus was worshipped at Agrae, and that the ceremonies there (like those of the frescoes) included divination in a mirror, phallic ritual, and flagellation, are thoroughly unsatisfactory; nor is it clear how the derivation from Agrae is consistent with the character of a ceremony which (we are told) was performed only by women. The rest of the fourth study is mainly psychological, and contains a collection of illustrations from ancient and modern ceremonies.

The volume concludes with a chapter of *Corollari*, in which also there is much disputable matter. It is far from true that Pythagoreanism was entirely identical with Orphism, though, no doubt, doctrines like the Orphic entered largely into it; and the author's account of the doctrines of Heraclitus as simply a restatement in general form of the Zagreus-myth and its lessons needs very careful scrutiny. (We are promised a fuller treatment of Heraclitus in a forthcoming number of *Gnosis*.) Even more one-sided is the contention that Orphism played the main part in the transformation of the historical Jesus into the Pauline Christ—the latter, we are told, being closely modelled on Zagreus, the dying and re-living God,

who guaranteed salvation in the life to come. This part of the work shows less understanding of early Christianity than of Orphism; the influence of the latter on the former is greatly overstated, however true it may be that Orphic ideas afforded a soil favourable to the growth of Christianity. This chapter, however, and indeed the book as a whole, contains much useful

material, and the work is well supplied with references; many interesting suggestions are made, and some well-worn problems re-discussed; and if the solutions offered are carefully tested, the perusal of the book is likely to lead the reader to a better comprehension of the subjects with which he deals.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

### THE TREES, SHRUBS, AND PLANTS OF VIRGIL.

*The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil.*  
By JOHN SARGEAUNT. 8vo. Pp. vii  
+ 149. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell,  
1920. 6s. net.

MR. WARDE FOWLER, in his illuminating address to the Classical Association at the recent meeting at Newcastle-on-Tyne, said: 'Roman poetry and oratory need to be more generously and humanly interpreted, now that the texts are becoming more scientifically settled.' No one has done more to bring about this desirable consummation than has Mr. Warde Fowler himself in his three charming studies of *Aen.* VII. (in part), *Aen.* VIII., and *Aen.* XII., and he has found worthy followers in Mr. Royds, who has written on the *Birds, Beasts, and Bees of Virgil*, and in the writer of the book now before us.

The late Mr. H. P. Platt, in his delightful little book, *Byways in the Classics* (p. 123), pointed out the lively way in which scholars tilt at the errors of their fellows, and Mr. Sargeaunt has no scruples in referring to places where, in his opinion, editors and lexicons are wrong. When I remember my school days, and the way in which the dicta of masters upon points of grammar and translation were regarded as indisputable, it is soothing to compare Mr. Sargeaunt's note on 'Nux' (*Georg.* I. 187) with Mr. Page's note on the same word. Happy are the students of today, whether young or old, who can read Mr. Sargeaunt's Introduction, with its lucid explanation of the names of plants and parts of plants, and the signification of the various words for colours before reading the *Georgics*. The note on 'Amellus' (*Georg.* IV.

271 ff.) clears up a passage which used to puzzle me when a boy, and, in fact, most of the book contains information not to be found in the ordinary noted editions of Virgil, or the dictionaries. I would ask Mr. Sargeaunt, when his book goes to a second edition, to increase the value of it by giving his references for passages quoted from other writers; e.g., in his note on 'Castanea,' he mentions that the timber was useful for building, but that some Roman architects objected to its weight. Who were the architects, and why should they have put forward the weight as an objection? Chesnut is not a particularly dense wood; the weight of a cubic foot is 38 lbs. as against 43 lbs. for ash and beech, 36 lbs. for elm, from 27 lbs. to 41 lbs. for various kinds of pine, and 48 lbs. to 58 lbs. for oak. Chesnut, being practically worm-proof, was much used for roofs in the middle ages (there is a fine example in good condition at Cleeve Abbey), though some authorities say that the wood called chesnut was really the timber of *Quercus sessiliflora*. Concerning the line (*Ecl.* II. 51) *cana legam tenera lanugine mala*, Mr. Sargeaunt says that it is difficult to make anything. 'The editors say quinces, but this ignores "cana."' Pliny, however (*N.H.* XV. 14), definitely mentions a woolly apple: *Paene peregrina sunt in uno Italiae agro Veronensi nascentia, quae lanata appellantur. Lanugo ea obducit, struthis quidem Persicisque plurima; iis tamen peculiare nomen dedit, nulla alia commendatione insignibus*. These woolly apples would, therefore, not seem to be a valuable gift, but if quinces be meant, I have myself seen in Persia quinces of exquisite colour and fragrance, which



were covered with a curious silvery, flocculent network, which would have made a gift worthy of any lover. In his note on *Georg. I. 74*, '*laetum siliqua quassante legumen*,' Mr. Sargeaunt would appear to go out of his way to find a recondite meaning when he follows Martyn in seeing a reference to threshing the crop. Surely '*siliqua quassante*' only refers to the dry pod rustling in the wind before picking.

(*Ecl. II. 18*), '*Alba ligustra cadunt*.' I am entirely at one with Mr. Sargeaunt in his detestation of privet. Its only redeeming feature is that it is the food of the larva of one of the most beautiful of our Lepidoptera, i.e. the privet hawk moth, but the Romans, as well as Tennyson, seem to have admired the hue of its flowers, e.g. *Martial I. 115*, '*puella candidior ligustro*.' On pp. 87 and 89 Mr. Sargeaunt talks of 'the heaviness' of the under-surface of the leaves of both olive and oleaster. Should not this read 'hoariness'? He has made an obvious slip on p. 97, where he says that the capsules of the poppy abound 'in opium or hashish.' The drug hashish is derived from *Cannabis indica*, and has nothing to do with the poppy.

*Georg. I. 266*: '*Nunc facilis rubea texatur fiscina virga*.'

Mr. Sargeaunt discusses Servius's reading, '*Rubea*,' and the reference to Rubi. He also tells us that Pliny says, 'the withies of the bramble with the prickles removed were used to make baskets.' I have been unable to trace this reference, but I did find a passage (*N.H. XVI. 69*) where he says that they were used for tying up vines: '*recisisque aculeis rubi alligant*.' That anyone

should try to make baskets from bramble shoots seems to me incredible, although possibly not more incredible than the use of Butcher's Broom (*Ruscus aculeatus*) for tying up vines, as Mr. Sargeaunt points out in his note on that plant. Wild Butcher's Broom is common in South Devonshire, and in my undergraduate days there used to be plenty of it in Magdalen Walks.

*Ulva, Georg. III. 175, et al.* Mr. Sargeaunt identifies this plant as *Cladium mariscus*—the fen sedge. His description of the plant certainly suits all the passages which he quotes, but, on the other hand, both *Pliny XVII. 35*, and *Columella IV. 13*, mention it as being used for vine ties, and both lay stress on the fact that the ties made therefrom are soft, and so do not injure the young shoots.

The description of *Cladium mariscus* does not seem to fit these facts, so may not '*ulva*' be used at times for different kinds of sedge, despite Mr. Sargeaunt's dictum? The notes on '*Vitis*' are most informing, and I would beg Mr. Sargeaunt not only to bring out a second edition of his book, but also to bring out an annotated edition of Keightley. He would do it admirably, and the book would be valuable.

In 1530 Sir Thomas Elyot published a book on educational reform, called *The Boke of the Governour*, wherein he remarks, 'Lorde God! howe many gode and clene wittes of children be now a days perrished by ignorant schole-maisters!' So long as schoolmasters exist who can write like Mr. Sargeaunt, this sorrowful complaint will not be heard.

H. P. CHOLMELEY.

#### DE HERCLE, MEHERCLE, CETERISQUE ID GENUS PARTICULIS.

*De Hercle, Mehercle, ceterisque id genus particulis.* By Dr. ANDERS GAGNÉR. Greifswald, 1920.

THIS is a thoroughly sound and scientific piece of work, such as we have learned to expect from Sweden: the writer is a Docent in the University of Uppsala. He discusses the origin, prosody, and use of the words *hercle*,

*pol*, and the compounds *mehercle*, *edepol*, *medius fidius*, *ecastor*, *mecastor*; also *edi*, *medi* (*Titinius iii.*). The derivation of some of these swearing formulae is notoriously difficult, in Latin as in other languages (cf. p. 44, n. 9). But I have no fault to find with Gagnér's derivations: the *me* he regards not as a vocative (for *mi*, Skutsch), but as the accusative—the full expression being, as

Festus said, *ita me Hercules (Castor) iunct*. The vocative *hercle* (from an *o*-stem, Ἡρακλε-) is explained as due to contamination with a form of invocation—*me, Hercule (Castor). iunua* or *iunato*. The *e* of *edepol*, *ecastor*, *edi* he regards with Persson as a 'particula invocativa' of pronominal origin (*ē* or *ē*), and *enos* of the Arval hymn as not a form of *nos* but two words—this *e* and *nos*. The second syllable of *edepol* and *edi* is treated as voc. sing. of *deus* (*dee*, *dē*, shortened to *dē*) or *dīus*. In *medius fidius* we have the nom. of this word. Gagnér also enters the lists in favour of the form *Hercles* for *Hercules*; he does not regard it as Plautine, but quotes among other passages *Stich.* 223 (here *Hercules* is surely right), *Most.* 528, *Epid.* 179 as giving it support.

The quantity of *mē* when compounded with *hercle* is uncertain; its shortening would present no difficulty (p. 24). The compound *mehercle* is always trisyllabic in *Plautus* and *Terence* (p. 24).<sup>1</sup> Here Gagnér is right, unless *Most.* 720 is an exception. But in a good many places his tone is overconfident: p. 55 as to the impossibility of *expurigo*; p. 111 as to the statement of Lodge that *edepol*, etc., may have a

special relation to a particular word in the sentence (*Lex. Plaut.* pp. 451, 445); p. 19 as to the quantity *edepol*, which rests only on two doubtful passages (*Cas.* 326, *Mil.* 1255); p. 139 as to the reading in *Rud.* 1413. We are all liable to mistakes—even the youngest of us; e.g. Gagnér's views on hiatus are too mechanical: in *si adspexerit Truc.* 672 and in *ni hanc Men.* 471 (pp. 17 n., 56) it is unacceptable to me because the two words belong to the same speech-group<sup>2</sup>; again the scansion *hercle mi régnum Curc.* 211 and *dicere: immo hercle Poen.* 1231 (pp. 52, 58) are not above criticism.<sup>3</sup> Some passages in the book might have been abbreviated or omitted with advantage—e.g. the note on *Mil.* 1006 (p. 119).

Probably the most useful part is the classification of all the instances in which these words appear in O.L. dramatic verse (pp. 111-195). Here the textual critic will find the means of controlling emendations by parallel passages—a matter of the utmost importance, if emendations are to be tested by their exact conformity with the usages of *Plautus* and *Terence*, as they should be.

E. A. SONNENSCHIEIN.

#### OPERA HACTENUS INEDITA ROGERI BACONI.

*Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*, Fasc. V. *Secretum Secretorum cum Glossis et Notulis. Tractatus Brevis et Utilis ad declarandum quedam obscure dicta. Nunc primum edidit ROBERT STEELE. Accedunt Versio Anglicana ex Arabico edita per A. S. FULTON, versio vetusta Anglo-Normanica nunc primum edita.* One vol. 8vo. Pp. lxiv+318. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1920. 28s. net.

MR. STEELE has added to the quickly increasing tale of hitherto unpublished

works of Roger Bacon now being issued from the Press of Bacon's own University an edition of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Secretum Secretorum*, translated from Arabic into Latin, as given in a Bodleian MS. of the thirteenth century, with Bacon's introduction and notes. He has added an introduction and notes of his own, a literal version by Mr. Ismail Ali and Mr. Fulton—very useful as a key to the Latin—and a mediaeval French rendering from a MS. at Paris.

The *Secretum Secretorum* belongs to the apocryphal literature relating to Alexander and Aristotle. The earliest

<sup>1</sup> My note on *Rud.* 1365 should be corrected in this sense. But Gagnér is not aware that when I wrote it (1891) the *disyllabic* scansion held the field, as shown by Fleckeisen's reading of *Ter. Eun.* 67, 411 (based on Bentley), and Schoell's of *Most.* 720. The purpose of my note was to assert (for the first time) the *trisyllabic* scansion; yet Gagnér stones me and Lindsay,

who followed my lead! The word occurs only six times in *Plautus* and *Terence*. To my examples add *Stich.* 250 *Ego illō mehercle*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> I heartily accept hiatus at this point of the verse, when there is anything like a pause to justify it.

<sup>3</sup> Gagnér does not believe in *hercl* (p. 58).

extant forms of it are in Arabic, but it lays claim—though, as Mr. Steele argues, most likely without justification—to a Greek original, and probably existed in Syriac, whence it is said to have been translated into Arabic; no Greek or Syriac version, however, has as yet come to light. It contains instructions given by Aristotle to his pupil on his kingly duties—instructions often based on astrological principles. It had a considerable vogue in the middle ages; and Roger Bacon, always interested in astrology, made it the subject of a commentary. He even, at least once, seems to have interpolated his text; for when at the end of III. 9 (p. 135) we are told that there are not only five planets, five kinds of animal, five principal parts of a plant, five musical tones, and five *dies nobiles*, but *et quinque sunt porte maris*, Mr. Steele is surely right in supposing that the Englishman has added to his author's list the famous Cinque Ports of his own country.

Some of Bacon's remarks are interesting. He will not indeed assert that Plato, Aristotle, Avicenna and such like enjoyed *graciam gratum facientem*, but is convinced that they were granted *magnum graciam gratis datam*. He will not affirm Aristotle's translation into heaven, but neither will he affirm his damnation and that of other heathen sages. The French translator of *Secretum* ventures less far. Good-living pagans, he thinks, will dwell in darkness, but, as in Dante's *Inferno*, exempt from pain. The reference to Averroes' comment on Aristotle's remarks in *De Caelo* I. concerning the sanctity of the number three (*propter cultum Trinitatis*, as Bacon says) should be I. 2 as on p. 268, not I. 3 as on p. 8; and according to the Venice edition of 1574 *Dicit* should be *Dedit*. There are allusions to the comet of 1264 (10. 32) and to a total eclipse of the sun, expected when Bacon wrote (11. 30), which he thinks will come sooner than the astronomers predict. The words *quam qui vellent sapientes in hac scientia* can hardly be right as they stand; perhaps delete *qui*. One would like to be able to identify the great man in France (105. 28)—the greatest after the king—who was to

Bacon's knowledge cured physically and morally by the wonderful medicine called *Gloria Inestimabilis* together with certain ingredients, which if not to be had in England, could be bought at the great French fairs or at Montpellier—then, of course, the principal medical school north of the Alps. Was he not St. Louis' brother, Alphonse of Poitiers, who in fact seems to have recovered from a paralytic affection which in 1252, eighteen years before his death, was held to be incurable?

I may perhaps be allowed to mention some points of contact between this work of Bacon's and the *Policraticus* of John of Salisbury. He refers to *Policr.* VIII. 7 on p. 72. 22. He mentions (3. 11) a distinction between *mathesis* and *matesis*, and inveighs with characteristic violence against certain *glomerelli nescientes Grecum*, who make *matēsis* mean legitimate science, *mathēsis* magic or divination, whereas in his own view the exact contrary is the truth. Hugh of St. Victor, who mentions the distinction (*Erud. Did.* II. 4), does not refer to the difference of quantity, but makes *mathesis* = doctrine and *matesis* = divination, so far agreeing with Bacon. John of Salisbury (*Policr.* I. 9), on the other hand, ignores the difference of aspiration, but takes *mathēsis* to mean magic and *mathēsis* science. He thus falls under Bacon's censure along with the 'Greekless glomerels' and their authority, Eberhard's *Graecismus*, and also (as Mr. Steele points out, p. viii) with his own *Opus Tertium*, which agrees with the *Policraticus*. The *Opus Majus* has yet another variant (though Mr. Steele speaks as if it agreed with the *Opus Tertium*); here *mathēsis* = vera mathematica, *matēsis* = falsa mathematica or divinatio. Bacon also changes the 'Greekless glomerels' (60. 29) with the misspelling *exennia* for *xennia*. Both forms—without the superfluous duplication of the *n*—are found in twelfth-century MSS. of the *Policraticus*; but what appears to be Becket's presentation copy has *exenia*. On p. 58. 22 Bacon ascribes the saying *Rex illiteratus est asinus coronatus* to Henry I., as also does William of Malmesbury; John of Salisbury (*Pol.* IV. 6) gives it to an unnamed king of the Romans, and the

*Gesta Consulium Andegavensium* to Count Fulk II. of Anjou.

Mr. Steele's impeccable accuracy in transcribing MSS. is well known to those who have had occasion to test it; but one may sometimes differ from his judgment as to the text to be preferred. His corrections of *humorum* to *humero-rum* (73. 35) and of *senciet* to *sencient* (125. 6) are needless. In both cases the MS. reading gives a better sense. In the second he has been misled by a mistake of punctuation: there should be a comma after *fient*. P. 144. 5 for *tuam* read *suam*. *Tuam* may indeed have stood in the original form of the Latin translation, since it seems to agree with the Arabic; but a sentence in the Arabic has dropped out in the Latin, and without this sentence *tuam* makes nonsense. There seems no need to correct *corruptibili* (157. 15) to *corporali* as suggested on p. 276. Why does Mr. Steele print the same abbreviation as *repara* (155. 30) and as *repera* (156. 25)?

I turn to other points connected with the text and with Bacon's annotations. In Bacon's *v.l. correpcione sui comparis* for *corrupcione sui corporis* (149. 18) *comparis* seems to be right, though *corrupcione* gives better sense than *correpcione*. The successive sentences, *Noli frequentare*, etc., and *Non temptabis*, etc., at the beginning of III. 19 (p. 152) must surely be alternative versions of the same original. Of Bacon's variants on p. 158. 13, 14, *ipsum* (perhaps his own suggestion) for *ipsa* is an improvement, but not *periculorum* for *miraculorum*. On p. 159. 10 the vulgate *habilitatem* is preferable to *humilitatem* of our MS. On p. 519. 23 Bacon's *v.l. ente* is perhaps better than *etate*; so may be also (in view of *contrariis*, 160. 1) the vulgate

*contrariantibus* (159. 20) than *incessantibus* of our MS., though possibly *incessantibus* has been corrected to a more ordinary word with a similar meaning. Bacon's *intermediorum* for *inter radiorum* (160. 3), *quoniam* for *que* (160. 4), and (as Mr. Steele says) *insidiacionem* for *insinuationem* (160. 29), seem to be right; and the vulgate *errantium* for *circumstancium* (160. 18). Here too Mr. Steele agrees. The Arabic appears to confirm Bacon's *Homo* (i.e. the planet Saturn) for *racio* (160. 29); and on the other hand the MS. *Homo* (160. 33) where Bacon gives *hoc est* in his note. In 69. 14 Bacon explains the odd expression *deserit linguam* to mean *facit disertam linguam*. According to the Arabic the rubbing of the gums with aromatic herbs is recommended as loosening or freeing the tongue and clearing the speech. I owe to Dr. Cowley (who kindly examined the Arabic for me) the suggestion that the original reading of the Latin may have been *disserat* ('unlocks' or 'opens'), which Ducange attests as a mediaeval spelling of the late Latin *deserat*.

The story about Hippocrates and the physiognomist (165. 6) really belongs to Socrates. Its transference in Arabic tradition to the father of medicine is explained by Greenhill in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography* II. 434, art. Hippocrates. I do not know why Mr. Steele brackets *tenentur homines regem vel* (52. 16, 17); the words make quite good sense as they stand. The supposed first book of the *Secretum* on the immortality of the soul, printed by Taegius 1516 and given on p. xxiv, is obviously a Renaissance forgery; the reference to the *Axiochus* is by itself sufficient evidence of this.

C. C. J. W.

#### PHILLIMORE'S SECOND EDITION OF STATIUS' *SILVAE*.

P. Papini Stati *Silvae*. Recognovit brevique adnotatione instruxit IOANNES S. PHILLIMORE. Editio altera correctior. One vol. 8vo. Pp. xxiv + text (pages not numbered). Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano (published 1920). 3s. 6d.

READERS of the *Classical Review* need no reminder of the existence of the MS. problem concerning the *Silvae*, for it has often been discussed in its pages in notices of editions and, as a separate question, in relation to the literary discoveries of Poggio or the readings re-



corded by Politian in a copy of the *editio princeps* kept in the Corsini collection at Rome. The subject may be tiresome, but it is by no means dead; and Professor Phillimore realises that during the dozen or more years which have elapsed since his first edition (the preface of the second is dated 1917, though publication has been delayed until recently) there have appeared books and articles constituting fresh material to be reckoned with: e.g. not only Klotz's second edition of the *Silvae* and that by Saenger (Petrograd, 1909), but such works as Professor Clark's *Asconius*, Mr. Garrod's *Manili Astronomicum* II., Walser's *Poggius Florentinus, Leben und Werke*, and Sabbadini's *Le Scoperte di Codici*. Consequently the old questions have to be handled again, 'quamquam plerosque iam pertaesum est tam Poggi quam Politiani,' says the editor, who proceeds to usher in his vigorous rewriting of the *praefatio* with the frank declaration: 'Quanto libentius molestissimas dubitatiunculas in malam crucem abire iussissem! Sed pudor est re nondum decertata deficere, quamquam nullo studio in eiusmodi tricas trahor quae lectoribus excusandae esse videantur.'

Professor Phillimore adheres to his opinion expressed in the first edition that Poggio carried off with him the ancient MS. of the *Silvae*, of which he had also secured a transcript by the scribe, who is described by him as 'ignorantissimus omnium viventium'; and that Politian had access to and excerpted the 'Corsinian' readings from this ancient exemplar when it no longer had attached to it the *Punica* of Silius and the *Astronomica* of Manilius. He makes out a good case in his entertaining examination of Thielscher's theory that Politian's words can be understood as applicable to the manuscript in Madrid; and his position may be summarised in his own words:

Unicusne auctor liber Matritensis? contendunt Klotz, Vollmer, Thielscher; his adstipulantur nonnulli quorum me vel magis movet auctoritas. Tamen ἐνέχω. Paulo probabilius id contendere quam olim non nego, sed et ad alteras partes succurrit nonnihil auxilii; demonstratum esse nego. Atque idcirco exulare non iussi quicquid est lectionum Corsinianarum.

It is obviously of textual importance to believe that there are two avenues leading back to Poggio's lost MS., namely through the *adnotationes Corsinianae* and through the *Matritensis*; yet, even if we do so believe, our difficulties are not ended. There are still such queries to settle as 'how much in the Corsinian marginal notes comes from the old Codex?' and, in reference to the *Matritensis*, 'what was the nationality of the scribe?'

To avoid, however, serving up *crambe repetita*, one must turn to the text. Unfortunately, although inevitably, one has to resign oneself to many *loci desperati*, equally hopeless to-day as they were to Heinsius, Gronovius, and Markland. They are beyond the reach even of that process of bold experiment in textual emendation whereby Professor Phillimore justifies the proposal of previous conjectures of his own now cancelled:

sic enim denique in melius corrigetur vitiosa veterum scriptorum traditio si pingues criticorum irrisiones spernes, si omnem lapidem moveas, si multa vel minus probabilia tentes.

This is a principle of criticism that can easily run riot; but on the whole I should regard the earlier edition as more adventurous and this later one as more restrained.

The text is not inconsiderably altered—at some points by judicious withdrawal of emendations temerarious or otherwise unsatisfactory, at other points by fresh suggestions. One does not read far without encountering change. In the first sentence of Statius' preface *prodierint* has become *profugissent*, a tense in line with Dr. Postgate's *procurrissent* and Krohn's *provolassent*; and, in the next sentence, the important gap of eleven letters, where Politian detected an *o* unrecorded in the *Matritensis*, now exhibits, instead of the *oportet me huius* of Domitius, the editor's restoration *opus erat hos* (ex Hieron. *Ep.* XLVII. 3). Towards the close of Statius' preface, where the first edition left *†domomum†*, there is now adopted Cartault's proposal *de me vivi*, while in the notes the alternative possibilities '*commodum* vel *idoneum*' are still offered.

I. i. 65: *frangit*, preferred in the note of the first edition, is sensibly dropped: it is too close to *fragor*.

ii. 13: the regular form of the ablative *cesto* replaces *cestu*, and the unattested *nivens* has disappeared from the note on l. 23. At l. 45 the new reading *praepete suspensum* is, to my mind, an attractive emendation by Professor Phillimore for *te potius prensum*. At l. 60 *furto*, previously cited from Markland in the note, is now in the text; and this, it may be observed, is only one of many instances where more weight is deservedly given to Markland's authority. At l. 203 I feel the text is improved by the removal of *viduae* of the first edition: it may be that *viduae*, as Dr. Postgate characterised it, is 'ingenious and possible' (C.R. 1906, p. 320), but *nitidae* is a better epithet for *Pisae*.

iii. 70: *†illis ipse antris Anienem†* is changed for the better to *illic ipse antris Anien*, *illic* being Krohn's contribution. In l. 109 *detectus* is replaced by Professor Housman's *detertus*. He is also followed in the change of order in I. v. 37-39, a troublesome passage, where Professor Phillimore has altered his previous text,

*quaque Tyri niveas secat et Sidonia rupes*  
to  
*quam tereti vena fucat Sidonia rupes.*

II. i. 28: Professor Housman's *crudi* is adopted for *†et diu†* of the first edition. l. 67: *muta domus*, *fateor* is kept as before, but in the note, which no longer records Professor Slater's *mota domu statio*, the editor states his inclination to read *heu mutata domus*. ll. 127-130 have been transformed since the first edition by the adoption from Dr. Postgate of *telae* for *vestes* in l. 127, by the acceptance of the previously obelised *quas vestes* in l. 128, and the adoption, again from Dr. Postgate, of *angustante telas* for *angusta telas* (M) in l. 130. At ll. 198-199 is a passage where 'haeret sensus'—

*inde magis sequitur, neque enim magis ille*  
*trahentem*  
*spernit et ignota credit de stirpe nepotum,*

and instead of the suggestion of the former note,

*inde manum, leviterque trahit: magis ille*  
*trahentem*

without alteration of person in the verbs of the next line, an advance in dramatic force is gained by the proposal:

*inde monens (neque enim sequitur magis ille*  
*trahentem)*  
*'spernis et ignota credis de stirpe nepotum.'*

ii. 18-19: it is questionable whether on *e terris occurrit dulcis amaro lymphamari* it is worth while chronicling Polster's suggestion of *e thermis*: no doubt *balnea* has occurred just before, but surely it is an incredibly matter-of-fact fancy that Statius' *dulcis lymphamari* should be only bath-water!

iii. 3: the new suggestion of *cernua nata* for *incurvata* is decidedly ingenious, and strikes me as more likely than the notion of changing *visu* to *avulsu* in l. 39 or the actual alteration of *secrete* to *secate* in l. 69. The note on *stagna invida et invida tela*, l. 38, introduces Professor Slater's *stagna invia*, but the text remains unchanged; and this is justifiable, for the repetition is not un-Statian.

v. 28: *bibitique* is commendably withdrawn.

vi. 70: *cardine adultae* now appears as *germen adultae*, accepted from Saenger, whose *unanimum* for *Aonium* is recorded in the note on l. 54. l. 93 contains Professor Housman's emendation of *et ipse* to *flesse*.

vii. 67: *quo fulmen ducis inter arma divi* is no longer regarded as corrupt, but the comment is made: 'excidit certe subsequens [versus] qui sententiam explebat.'

III. i. 128: the better form *Capreae* replaces *Caprae* of the first edition.

iii. 57: in *et saevi Tirynthius horrida regis* the editor has cancelled his suggestion of *aequaevi*. l. 99: for the unsatisfactory *exitus* Saenger's *sensibus* is mentioned as one emendation, and *nec secus* is withdrawn; and at the last line of this poem the form *piaclo*, previously proposed, is withdrawn in favour of the accepted reading *sepulcro*.

v. 104: *Inarimesque lacus* is an improvement on *Aenarumque lacus* in the earlier text (see C.R. 1906, p. 321).

IV. ii. 6: *non surgere*, a conjecture by Ellis, satisfactorily replaces *consur-*

*gere* (M) of the first edition. l. 54: Professor Phillimore no longer prefers *vittas* to *vultus*, though the latter does repeat the last word of l. 52, which Markland wished to alter to *visus*.

iii. 89: Baehrens' necessary correction of *obluat* to *abluat* is now accepted.

v. 9: Markland's *vernans*, unrecorded in the first edition, now replaces *veris* (M), but is not the most convincing of the additional borrowings. l. 12: as a variant for *statuere* Professor Clark's much more satisfying *studuere* is now recorded. l. 16: *ferbuerat*: Professor Slater's *servierat* is added to the apparatus criticus.

V. i. 6: *Phidiaca vel nata*: the alternatives *-ve animata* and *-ve novata*, which did not carry conviction, are dropped. l. 19: the text given,

*nigra domus, quis tum miseras accessus ad aures*

is a distinct improvement on that of the earlier edition,

*nigra domus questu, miseramque accessus ad aurem.*

ii. 60:

*haec iterent praecepta senes comitesque paterni*

is a change in order accepted from Professor Housman since the first edition. At l. 108 a plausible change is due to the adoption of Markland's correction of *medii bellare togati* to *media bellare*, etc.; and to Markland again is due the much greater force obtained in l. 117 by emending *armatum* to *Martem*, which now properly, I think, stands in the text. In l. 123 Professor Phillimore's new idea of *versantem* for *servantem* is a highly possible metathesis.

iii. 9: *sustinui* is, since the first edition, accepted from Markland for the common reading *extimui*; and in the

next line *ille ego* is taken over from him for *certe ego*, formerly read. ll. 31-32: Professor Phillimore's new suggestion of *Mulciber ignis exhibuit* for *vultibus ignis irrubuit* is not, to my mind, an improvement: artificial as Statius so often is, one would prefer him in writing of his dead father's funeral to be realistic rather than mythological. ll. 88: *nec foeda gavisam Pallade buxum*: the epithet in the first edition was Ellis' *bifida*. l. 127: *Phrygius qua puppe magister*: the epithet *gravidus* has been discreetly ejected.

This selection of alterations may serve to show that the volume is no mere reprint of the first edition, but a book whose living force is due to alert treatment of problems concerned with the text and manuscripts of Statius rather than to any absorbing qualities in the subject-matter of the poet himself. While grateful for the *Index Nominum*, I should like to advocate the conveniences of a bibliography and of numbered pages for the text. For the student, too, I cannot help wishing that it were practicable more commonly than at present to accompany works involving manuscript problems with a few typical reproductions, e.g. in this case a representative portion of the *Matritensis* exhibiting corrections, an undoubted example of Poggio's handwriting, and a specimen of Politian's *lectiones*: but I realise that all this would affect the price. The printing has been executed with great accuracy. I have noted only slight errata, e.g. in the apparatus criticus on the first page of the text the reference should be to *Praef.* p. xxii, not xx; and on II. i. 38 *limine M* should be *lumine M*.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

#### VIRGILE ET LES ORIGINES D'OSTIE.

*Virgile et les Origines d'Ostie*. Par JÉRÔME CARCOPINO. 8vo. One vol. Pp. x+818. With 20 plates (including 2 maps), 17 illustrations in text (including 2 maps). Paris: Bocard, 1919.

M. Carcopino's extraordinarily interesting work on *Virgil and the Origins of Ostia* is at once so rich in detail and

so comprehensive in scope that it is impossible to do it justice within the limits of an ordinary review. It is scarcely possible to do more than state its main thesis to the omission of a number of important arguments, which, if not precisely side issues, are at any rate not absolutely vital to the central theory.

The excavations at Ostia have yielded no remains that can be assigned to an earlier date than the fourth century, B.C. (probably 325 is the earliest date admissible.) What then of the old tradition which makes the foundation of Ostia go back to the age of the Kings? The inevitable answer is that the earlier Ostia must have been on a different site which, it is argued, must have lain to the east of the later part. It can scarcely have lain on the right bank where the Etruscan power was supreme and where Caere and Veii had salt pans at a very early date, nor at the mouth of the river on the left bank owing to the long-continued maritime supremacy of Antium. Of the existence of a primitive Ostia there can, however, be no doubt. It was the centre of a number of primitive cults, notably that of Vulcan, which point to its having been an ancient federal sanctuary, which prior to the Roman occupation can only have been in the hands of the Laurentes.

The Laurentes, however, are not to be regarded as the inhabitants of any city of Laurentum. The existence of such a city has, it is true, been generally assumed, but all attempts to identify its site—and there have been many—have been fanciful and unsupported by solid fact. The truth is that Laurentum never existed as a town. Laurentum is merely the *civitas*, while Lavinium—commonly regarded as its offshoot, with Aeneas as its traditional founder—was the *urbs* its capital. Laurentum is rarely mentioned in ancient texts and never in a single inscription. In the *Aeneid* the name is non-existent: where the word *Laurenti* occurs it is always explicable as the ablative of the adjective *Laurens*. There is no evidence in antiquity of the existence of a city of Laurentum, which cannot be explained on the assumption that Lavinium (or Lauro-Lavinium, as it is often called) was the town of the Laurentes. The Itineraries, it is true, do mention a Laurentum as lying between Lavinium and Ostia, but the Itineraries are late, and their Laurentum is probably no more than the Imperial Villa in the Laurentine territory. Of the site of Lavinium there is no doubt: it has rightly been identified with that of the

modern Pratica. And, further, the topography of the capital of Latinus in the *Aeneid* exactly corresponds with that of Lavinium. As to the foundation of Lavinium by Aeneas, it is to be explained as a second foundation of an already existing city.

But the re-founding of an existing city will hardly satisfy the demands of the legend of Aeneas, and we must search elsewhere for the new Troy, the city of destiny of which Aeneas is the fated founder. That city, says M. Carcopino, is none other than Ostia. It is at the mouth of Tiber that Aeneas makes his first camp. And that camp is more than a mere temporary camp. It has walls, gates, houses, and a palace. It is founded with due ceremony, and is emphatically and essentially an *urbs*. It is there that the omen of the white sow is found, it is there that the place named Troia and the *praedium Troianum* existed. The site is to be placed to the east of the later Ostia, immediately above the sharp bend in the ancient course of the Tiber. Virgil thus dissociates himself from the tradition as given by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and generally accepted by Virgilian commentators, which makes Lavinium the new city founded by Aeneas.

The theory is ingenious, and M. Carcopino argues his case extremely well. But there is one crucial point at which the theory halts, if it does not actually break down—namely, the postulated pre-existence of Lavinium as Latinus' capital. It is difficult—despite M. Carcopino's ingenious special pleading—to accept the view that the founding of Lavinium is merely a second founding. The promise of Jupiter to Venus *cernes urbem et promissa Lavini | moenia* (*Aen.* I. 258) is weak beyond all belief, if it refers merely to a second founding, while *mihi moenia Teucri | constituent urbiq; dabit Lavinia nomen* (12. 193) becomes perilously near being meaningless, if we are to suppose that the city was already called Lavinium. And even if we accept the non-existence of Laurentum<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M. Carcopino is successful in demolishing the existence of a historic Laurentum. It does not, however, necessarily follow that Virgil has not assumed its existence for the purpose of his poem.



and the pre-existence of Lavinium as proved—a view which would be rendered easier by the supposition that the name of the town was originally *Lavinium* (see *Serv. ad A. I. 2*) and changed by Aeneas to *Lavinium*—and assume that the *Aeneid* culminates in a *synoecismus* of Trojan and Laurentian, it is clear that Lavinium and not Troia marks that culmination. In that case the foundation of Troia-Ostia will have value rather as the formal fulfilment of a prophecy than as an important event in the political history of primitive Latium.

But M. Carcopino's theories go far beyond this: he proceeds to argue that Thybris—whom he refuses to identify with Tiberinus or Tiberis—is '*un dieu universel et souverain*,' river god, war-god, fire-god, sun-god in one, identical with the mysterious Vulcan whose worship found its centre at Ostia (and, it may be added, with *Thymbraeus Apollo* as well). Indeed, he goes so far as to summarise his views in the words: 'Virgile a cru retrouver sa religion personnelle dans la religion d'Ostie, et dans le site ostien de la nouvelle Troie les fondements inébranlables de sa patrie.' If this is the case, Virgil has concealed the fact with more than matchless art. The history of Roman religion affords exceptional opportuni-

ties for the craft of 'making bricks without straw,' and, until M. Carcopino produces far more substantial proofs, we must regard his Vulcanus-Thybris as enjoying a terribly unstable throne.

But though we reject his theories as regards the cults of Ostia and cast grave doubts on his views as to the relative importance of Troia-Ostia and Lavinium in the Virgilian scheme, we shall yet none the less find the book indispensable to our Virgilian studies. It throws fresh light on a number of Virgilian problems, notably on the *finis Sicani* (p. 458), the identification of the *Numicus* (p. 488), the scene of the ambush (p. 332), and the locality of Albunea (p. 338)—which with Bonstetten and Probus (*ad G. I. 10*) he identifies with the Zolforata, north-east of Pratica and due north of Ardea. And these are but a few examples. The book is a treasure-house of Virgilian lore. The reader will not always find himself in agreement with M. Carcopino, but he will find full and honest statement of the problems involved, and be stimulated to fresh thought and interest. And last but not least, he will have before him a wealth of topographical detail and a map of the Virgilian sites far superior in convenience to anything hitherto available.

H. E. BUTLER.

#### THE GREEK ORATORS.

*The Greek Orators.* By J. F. DOBSON.  
Methuen and Co.

THIS book, we are told, is intended not only for Sixth Form boys and University students, but also for general readers, whose interest in the history and literature of Greece is increasing and deserves encouragement. It is a difficult task to give in 300 pages a full, intelligible, and interesting account of such an important side of Greek life, but Professor Dobson has succeeded in giving a very clear and accurate picture of the development of Greek oratory and the characteristics of its chief exponents, which will be especially valuable to those who have not time or opportunity for studying the more

elaborate works of Jebb, Blass, and others. The danger of such books as this is that they may be misused by 'classical' students as a source whence statements on the style of the authors treated may be gleaned at second-hand; and from this point of view it might be suggested that the value of the book would be increased if the author's skilful and scholarly translations of typical passages were to be supplemented by longer citations from the original Greek: the fragment of *Gorgias*, for instance (p. 17), would be much more instructive to students were the original added. Room might possibly be found for such additions by cutting down the lists of the more unimportant speeches of the various orators, which,

though making the book more complete as a work of reference, do not, perhaps, add greatly to the knowledge necessary for those who will find it most useful. The 'general reader' would be assisted by an introductory chapter, explaining the peculiarities and procedure of the assembly and law courts at Athens, which would make it easier to grasp the great differences in the circumstances of a speech by Lysias or Demosthenes, and, let us say, Marshall Hall or Lloyd George. Some such explanatory references are to be found in the book, but they are rather scattered: and is it not misleading to translate *δικασταί* by 'jury'? On the individual orators,

Professor Dobson's judgments are very sound and unprejudiced, and he gives that unduly neglected figure, Aeschines, his due; but possibly Lycurgus is given more space than he deserves, and Lysias less. The quotation from the introduction to the *Herodes* of Antiphon seems unnecessarily long, and an illustration of his narrative style would add to the interest.

Very few slips or misprints are to be observed: on p. 21 (end of § 1) it appears that the word 'the' should be inserted before 'great Athenian people,' and 'dominate' (p. 154) is clearly a slip.

J. B.

### GREEK HISTORY: ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS MEANING.

*Greek History: Its Problems and Its Meaning.* By E. M. WALKER. Small 8vo. Pp. 165. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1921.

THIS booklet contains a reprint of Mr. Walker's article on 'Greek History to B.C. 146' in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and the introductory lecture to his course on the 'Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία of Aristotle. It makes no attempt to array the facts of Greek history in a running narrative, but is content to characterise its succes-

sive ages and to bring into relief its chief determinant factors. Those who have no previous acquaintance with Greek History may be taken out of their depth by this volume; but the more advanced students will find it an admirable instrument for sorting and clarifying their ideas. Mr. Walker has picked out the key problems of Greek History with excellent judgment, and the arguments with which he resolves these problems stand out as clear as the ribs on a Greek mountain side.

M. C.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK).

ARCHAEOLOGY.—1921. May 9. Helen McClees, *A Study of Women in Attic Inscriptions* (D. M. Robinson). 'A good introduction, but the subject is meagrely treated, and the bibliography is unsatisfactory.' R. makes many suggestions for fuller treatment.

GEOGRAPHY.—1921. May 9. J. H. Breasted and C. F. Huth, *A Teacher's Manual accompanying the Breasted-Huth Ancient History Maps* (C. K.). 'The descriptions of the maps are very good, and valuable references to books and articles are added.'

HISTORY.—1921. H. J. Bassett, *Macrinus and Diadumenianus* (G. A. Harrer). A typical dissertation for the doctorate.

(The issues of April 11 and May 2 contain long bibliographies of classical articles in non-classical periodicals.)

### NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR DAS KLAS- SISCHE ALTERTUM, ETC. (ILBERG).

1916-1920 INCLUSIVE.

(XXXVII./XXXVIII.-XLV./XLVI.)

[Heft 5 of 1920 has not been received.]

ARCHAEOLOGY.—1919. 10. E. Bischoff, *Die griechische Monatsnamen*. Considered from ethnological, philological, and religious standpoints.

ART.—1916. 1. H. Blümner, *Die Darstellung des Sterbens in der griechischen Kunst* (illustrated). Natural death is rarely represented. —1918. 1/2. F. Studniczka, *Das Bildnis Menanders* (illustrated). Discusses the chief extant portraits: the best is the Copenhagen bust (Bernouilli II. 113, 17, etc.).—1920. 1/2. E. Pfuhl, *Gedanken über Wesen und Werden der klassischen Kunst* (illustrated). An

able sketch, taking as text the Rayet head and the votive relief with four deities and dedicatory, both at Copenhagen (Arndt Pl. I, Brunn, Pl. 679).

# RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY.—1916. 9. M.

Pohlenz, *Kronos und die Titanen*. Kronos was the great pre-Greek vegetation god, dwelling on mountains. The Titans are the other gods of the same culture (not phallic). The mutilation of Ouranos was invented to explain the present stability of nature. Kronos had the task merely because he had a sickle (really an agricultural symbol). Zeus represents the religion of a new race. Kronos and the Titans were degraded by confusion with Ba'alchamman and with the Gigantes.—1917. 3. P. Corsen, *Das Osterfest*. The Easter festival was established at Rome in the second half of the second century, and aimed at replacing Attis worship.—8/9. B. Ankermann, *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Totemismus*. A lucid enquiry. Totemism is not religious: in its origin it is distinct from magic, animism, and the worship of ancestors and gods, but it has often been incorporated with all these, chiefly through racial mixture. Impossible to say whether any elements of totemism lie behind Egyptian or any European religion.—1918. 3. J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*. A brilliant sketch of the interplay of late Greek thought with Christianity, with especial attention to Plotinus, Iamblichus, Julian, and Synesius. Among G.'s points are the effects of economic distress on the pagan cults in the second half of the third century, and the long survival of paganism after the establishment of Christianity.—7/8. O. Gruppe, *Die Anfänge des Zeuskultus*. Zeus and *Dyāus* are identical in name only. The Indians adopted sky-father and earth-mother in Mesopotamia, the Greeks in Greece, both from older populations. Zeus-cult developed in Crete, with sacred caves. Rain-magic led to dramatisation of the god's life-history, the source of all later mysteries. The pre-Greek sky-father was *Pofida*, the earth-mother *Da* or *Do*. After-life beliefs entered through moon-worship. The spread of Zeus at the expense of Poseidon, found in Homer, was the work of 'Agamemnon.' The trident was at first the lightning.—1919. 9. L. Deubner, *Paian*. The Paean, a Cretan apotropaic dance and song, connected with no god, was adopted at Delphi in the eighth century, and civilised by association with Apollo. At first it was in 5-time (Cretic-Paeonic).—1920. 10. E. Kalinka, *Die Herkunft der griechischen Götter*. Fetichism, so common in Greece, comes from the older population. Two pre-Greek strata can be distinguished: the earlier used the bow, and from it come Apollo, Artemis, Herakles, etc. Only Zeus may perhaps be really Greek.

HISTORY.—1916. 5. O. Viedebant, *Hannibal und die römische Heeresleitung bei Cannae*. The battle was south of the Aufidus. Paulus must share the responsibility with Varro,

whose strategic plans are explained.—6. V. Gardthausen, *Das alter italischer Schrift und die Gründung von Cumae*. Attacks Montelius' view that Cumae was founded (as Eusebius says) in 1049 B.C., and that the colonists brought with them the art of writing. G. maintains (against Milani and Kretschmer) the derivation of Etruscan script from Cumae.—1917. 3. V. Gardthausen, *Die Scheidung der Octavia und die Hochzeit der Kleopatra*. The double era starting in 36 B.C. does not imply the marriage of Antony and Cleopatra; it is due to the importance of the acquisition of Coele Syria for Egypt's position as a Great Power.—4. A. Schulten, *Viriatum*. A detailed study of V.'s campaigns and genius.—10. S. Hellmann, *Die Asiatische Völkerwanderung*. Asiatic invasions of Europe from 375 A.D., and their permanent effects.—1918. 6. W. Nestle, *Politik und Moral im Altertum*. Examines ancient views of morality in politics from Homer to Plotinus, and approves of Thucydides, who is compared to Machiavelli, Frederic the Great, and Nietzsche.—1920. 1/2. M. Gelzer, *Die römische Gesellschaft zur Zeit Ciceros*. Emphasises the divergences of Roman and modern social organisation.—6/7. R. Laqueur, *Cäsars gallische Statthaltertschaft und der Ausbruch des Bürgerkrieges: I*. Maintains, against Mommsen, that, after Sulla, as before, the consular provinces belonged to the consuls as such. Caesar's command under Lex Vatinia expired March 1st, 55, not March 1st, 54. Much space is given to Cicero, *de provinciis consularibus*.—J. Geffcken, *Stimmungen im untergehenden Weströmerreich*. Especial stress is laid on Salvianus of Marseilles.—9. F. Oertel, *Der Niedergang der hellenistischen Kultur in Ägypten*. A sketch of social and economic changes in Egypt, from Alexander to the Arab conquest, based largely on papyri.

# PHILOLOGY, LINGUISTIC, AND METRIC.—

1918. 1. H. Werner, *Barbarus*. The word is onomatopoeic, and its essential idea is unintelligibility. W. traces its changes of meaning, and (with Cornu) derives 'bravo' from it.—10. A. Debrunner, *Die Besiedelung des alten Griechenland im Licht der Sprachwissenschaft*. Calls for a scientific classification of pre-Greek words and forms, and their distribution.—1919. 7/8. F. Hartmann, *Aorist und Imperfektum im Griechischen*. H. compares Greek texts with French and Russian translations. The Aorist describes an action in its totality, the Imperfect its beginning, duration, and repetition. Latin usage is a special development.—1920. 4. H. Weller, *Die Urform des Hexameters entdeckt*. Criticises E. Leumann's derivation of the hexameter from an Indo-Scythian verse-form. (9. Leumann replies.)

PALAEOGRAPHY AND PAPYRI.—1916. 8. A. Mentz, *Das Fortwirken der römischen Stenographie*. Traces the history of shorthand from Cicero to the present day, and shows the connexion of some modern German systems with the Tironian.—1917. 5. A. Körte, *Was*

verdankt die klassische Philologie den literarischen Papyrusfunden? An excellent summary.

GREEK LITERATURE.—1916. 2. W. Kroll, *Hellenistisch-römische Gedichtbücher*. Argues that the artistic arrangement of books of poems by the poet is an Alexandrian practice, copied at Rome.—5. M. Sisbourg, *Die Motivierung in der Alkestis des Euripides*. Elaborate but uninteresting.—1917. 2. J. Geffcken, *Studien zum griechischen Epi-gramm*. A sketch of this form from its origin to early Christian times.—8/9. H. Blümner, *Die Schilderung des Sterbens in der griechischen Dichtkunst*. Little parallelism between art and literature, except that both deal almost exclusively with violent death.—R. Petsch, *Die Troerinnen einst und jetzt*. A careful study of the *Troades*, and of its descendants and translations, down to Franz Werfel's, produced at Berlin in 1916.—10. G. Raddatz, *Das XXII. Buch der Odyssee*. Vindicates this book against Wilamowitz: it is composed on a scheme of triple grouping. The minor characters are less in the shade than in similar scenes of the *Iliad*.—1918. 7/8. E. Bruhn, *Zur dramatischen Technik des Sophokles*. Mainly an appreciative but critical account of a posthumous work ('*Die dram. Techn. des Soph.*') by Ulrich v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's son Tycho. T. v. W. emphasises Sophocles' tendency to sacrifice consistency of plot and psychology to the stage effect of particular scenes, especially his duplication of scenes, in order to produce two distinct effects, one of which would otherwise have swamped the other (especially in *Ajax*, *Trachiniae*, *Antigone*). Bruhn disagrees with much of T. v. W.'s analysis of the *Oed. Tyr.*, and gives his own views; and he criticises the last chapter (on the *Oed. Col.*), which is by the elder Wilamowitz. B. holds that all friendly references to Thebes come from the younger Sophocles' production of the play in 401.—1919. 1/2. E. Bethe, *Zeit und Einheit der Ilias*. Our *Iliad* is a unity, by one good poet: but (like the *Odyssey*) it is not earlier than 600 B.C., and borrows from Hesiod. Most stress is laid on the temple and statue of Athena at Troy, in Book VI.: essential to the fabric of the *Iliad*, and yet implying sixth-century artistic conditions. The writer probably knew the Greek *Iliad*. The *Ménis* was an eighth-century work.—4/5. W. Kranz, *Die Urform der attischen Tragödie und Komödie*. Aristotle, in the *Poetics*, used many fifth-century writers, who still possessed early tragedies. Hence his remarks on early tragedy are not (like his theory of origins—dithyramb and phallika) mere theory. Tragedy, in its earliest traceable form, was a lyric dialogue between the chorus and its leader: the epirrhematic scheme of song alternating with speech (originally in tetrameters) was borrowed from comedy. Comedy began with the parabasis only, a quite undramatic address to the audience.—7/8. M. Pohlenz, *Un mensonge de la science alle-*

*mande*? A convincing reply to Victor Bérard's attack on August Wolf.—W. Büchner, *Die psychologische Begründung im Philoktetes des Sophokles*. A reply to Tycho v. Wilamowitz, asserting the triviality of the inconsistencies (mostly in the prologue) and vindicating the characterisation.—1920. 4. H. Meyer-Benfey, *Die Elektra des Sophokles und ihre Erneuerung durch Hofmannsthal*. Not illuminating on Sophocles.—6/7. F. Stürmer, *Die Symmetrie in der Icherzählung des Odysseus*. Odysseus' narrative is rigidly symmetrical in arrangement.

LATIN LITERATURE.—1916. 3. W. Schwering (+), *Die sogenannte Kontamination in der lateinischen Komödie*. 'Contaminatio' does not mean combination of different plays. Donatus' comments show that Andria, Adelphi, Eunuchus each represents in essentials one Greek play. In Plautus' *Miles* and *Poenulus* the loose plots are the original Greek ones.—K. P. Schulze, *Besass Horaz eine Villa in Tibur?* Yes.—1917. 5. O. Blank, *Die erste Satire des Horaz*. An elaborate analysis.—1918. 10. G. Wissowa, *Aulus Senecus*. Frau Schulze-Smidt's novel *In Moor und Marsch* (1893) contains verse translations of a number of Latin poems ascribed to Aulus Senecus. The authoress (still living) says she found the originals in a MS. commonplace book of 1698 in her grandfather's library. Her brother took the book to India, and died of cholera; and the book was burnt. Wissowa believes this, and thinks the poems were either a humanist's exercises, or perhaps genuine fragments of Septimius Senecus (Baehrens, *F.P.R.*, p. 384). The only Latin lines preserved by Frau S. are 'Insula perdita gramine vestita natans in aequore maris.'—1919. 1/2. L. Alheit (+), *Charakterdarstellung bei Sallust*. A subtle study of Sallust's methods of presenting individuals and types.—6. H. Blümner (+), *Die Schilderung des Sterbens in der römischen Dichtung*. Violent deaths preponderate, as in Greek.—7/8. R. Heinze, *Horazens Buch der Briefe*. A study of the originality and influence of the *Epistles*.—N. Wecklein, *Zur Ars Poetica des Horaz*. Defends the structure of the poem, and calls attention to Jensen's recovery, from Philodemus *περί ποιημάτων*, of information about Horace's model Neoptolemus.—10. E. Wolf, *Die allegorische Vergilerklärung des Cristoforo Landino*. Considered as typical of Renaissance methods.—1920. 3. H. Wagenvoort, *Pantomimus und Tragödie im augusteischen Zeitalter*. The schools of (1) Bathyllus and (2) Pylades must be sharply distinguished. (1) carried on a traditional S. Italian form (of which Hellenistic *magodia* was an independent development): a favourite theme was Cyclops and Galatea. (2) started from the same source, but developed elaborate use of large chorus and orchestra, and dealt sensationally with tragic themes, influencing Roman tragedy. Horace quarrelled with Maecenas because M. liked pantomimes. 4. A. Klotz, *Beiträge zum Verständnis von*



*Virgils Hirtengedichten.* Virgil does not merely copy Theocritus. He deliberately alters T.'s effects, with results often misunderstood. K. applies his principles especially to III., V., and VIII.

PHILOSOPHY. — 1916. 3. O. Walzel, *Plotins Begriff der ästhetischen Form.* Treated in connexion with later thinkers, including Thomas Aquinas and Benedetto Croce.—6. M. Schneidewin, *Ein Versuch über die Rätsel des Platonischen Parmenides.* The *Parmenides* is not by Plato; it is influenced by Aristotle and by the Megarians.—1917. 3. W. Kroll, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Poseidonios.* Ascribes to Poseidonios' influence most later Greek mysticism, including Neopythagoreanism and the Hermetic system.—1918. 1/2. M. Wundt, *Der Zeitbegriff bei Augustin.* Traces the conception of time, from Pythagoreanism on. Plotinus made time subjective, but confused matters with his world-soul. Augustine first freed time wholly from spatial extension. He was helped by his extreme sensitiveness to sound (characteristically Roman).—E. Howald, *Heraklit und seine antiker Beurteiler.* Traces his influence down to Neoplatonism and the early Fathers.—1918. 4/5. A. Gercke, *Eine Niederlage des Sokrates.* In the *Protagoras* Plato means Socrates to be beaten. S. is here neither the real Socrates nor Plato's mouthpiece, but mainly a portrait of Eukleides: the dialogue is a warning against the dangers of the Socratic method. Its date is c. 390, shortly before the *Gorgias*.—1919. 3. W. Capelle, *Anaxagoras.* Deals with his physical views; these are superficial, if sometimes brilliant, and inferior to predecessors and contemporaries.—4/5. Same concluded. His *voûs* doctrine was more original and important than Tannery or Burnet allow. Zeller's account is still the best. 'Homoeomeria' is an Aristotelian coinage.—1920. 1/2. W. Süss, *Das Problem des Komischen im Altertum.* Interesting but not clearly arranged. Deals especially with Plato *Philebus* 47 D ff. and Aristotle *Poet.* 1449a 32. Süss denies that ἀνῶδυνον καὶ οὐ φθαρτικόν (Arist. *Lc.*) refers to the production of pain in others. He emphasises the differences between Plato and Aristotle.—3. J. Stenzel, *Platon und Demokritos.* Attempts to define Democritus' influence on Plato. With the Marburg school, S. traces this especially in the logical procedure of the *Sophistes*: but he tries to treat the matter more broadly than Cohn and Hartmann.

CHRISTIAN AND BYZANTINE. — 1916. 2. K. Heussi, *Nilus der Asket und der Überfall der Mönche am Sinai.* The autobiographical *Εἰς τὴν ἀναίρεσιν τῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾷ μοναχῶν* (Migne, *P.G.* 79, 583-694) ascribed (in the title) to Nilus Asceta, has nothing to do with him. Further, the story is deeply influenced by Greek Romance, and it is impossible to say what historical basis it has, if any. Nilus Asceta's genuine works suggest no connection with Sinai, but rather with N.W. Asia

Minor, perhaps Ancyra.—7. E. Bickel, *Das asketische Ideal bei Ambrosius, Hieronymus, und Augustin.* The origins of the ascetic ideal in the gospels, Gnosticism, and Greek philosophy are investigated, and their influence on these three doctors carefully unravelled.—1919. 10. E. Stein, *Die byzantinische Geschichtswissenschaft im letzten halben Jahrhundert.* A detailed critical account of this subject.

TOPOGRAPHY. — 1916. 3. A. Schulten, *Die historische Topographie.* The development of the study is traced from classical times. The first book showing complete appreciation of the subject is the *Italia* of Philip Clüver of Danzig († 1622). Modern historical topography is 'a daughter of the Romantic movement.'

SCIENCE. — 1917. 1. F. Boll, *Astronomische Beobachtungen im Altertum.* Calls attention to an ancient classification of stars by colours, expressed by reference to the planets. The results correspond surprisingly to modern observations. The *Tetrabiblos* of Claudius Ptolemaeus is especially important. This classification is of Babylonian origin, and provides a test for modern identifications of Babylonian star names. The results on the whole support Bezol, Kopff, and Boll himself, against Weidner. The obscure Tikpi-, Lumaschi-, and Maschu-stars (each seven in number) are those corresponding respectively to Jupiter, Mars, and Mercury: there are traces of a fourth list of seven, corresponding to Saturn.—1920. 8. W. Capelle, *Die griechische Erdkunde und Poseidonios.* An enthusiastic account of P.'s contribution to the theories of terrestrial zones, tides, seismology, ethnology, etc., laying great stress on his personal observations and travels. C. quotes few authorities, on the ground that he hopes soon to publish a fuller work.

#### PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(APRIL-JUNE, 1921.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—E. Bethe, *Griechische Lyrik* [Leipzig, 1920, Teubner. M.7] (Seeliger). In the main a successful attempt to reconstruct the personalities of the lyric poets from the surviving fragments of their writings; but reviewer disagrees in many details with B.'s arrangement and interpretation.—G. Schneider, *Platons Dialoge, Laches und Euthyphron* [Leipzig, 1918, Meiner] (Steiner). The mature thought and deep knowledge of S. († Dec. 10, 1917) are reflected throughout in introduction, translation, and notes.—S. Koperberg, *Polybii historiarum liber XXX. quoad fieri potuit restitutus* [Amsterdam, 1919, Campis] (Laqueur). Necessary and useful collection of material; but K. does not pay sufficient attention to the arrangement of the excerpts. Reviewer adds a long discussion of Τυχη in Polybius.—W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke*, 6 Bd. [Leipzig, 1920, Hinrichs. M.31.25+60%] (Lehmann). MSS., with exception of one of early seventh century, have been thoroughly examined and

a reliable text established; introductory matter already reviewed in *B. Ph. W.*, Jan. 13, 1917.—W. H. Roscher, *Die hippokratische Schrift von der Siebenzahl und ihr Verhältnis zum Altpythagoreismus* [Leipzig, 1919, Teubner. M.3.20] (Kind), and K. Mras, *Sprachliche und textkritische Bemerkungen zur spätlateinischen Übersetzung der hippokratischen Schrift von der Siebenzahl* [Wiener Studien, 1919] (Kind). R. again insists that Hippocrates' cosmology is essentially pre-Pythagorean; but M. shows that the style of the *Περὶ ἑβδομάδων* points to the period of the early Sophists.—W. A. Heidel, *Hippocratea I.* [Harvard Studies, 1914] (Kind). Welcome contributions to Hippocratic research.—O. Schmiedeberg, *Über die Pharmaka in der Ilias und Odyssee* [Strassburg, 1918, Trübner] (Kind). With the aid of Hippocrates S. examines Homer's medicinal herbs and attempts to identify many.—A. Kurfess, *Curae Constantinianae* [Berlin, 1920, Weidmann] (Wellnhofer). Contains three articles, two on Virgil's 4th *Eclogue* and one on Plato's *Timaeus* in Constantine's Speech to the Assembly of the Saints; K. concludes, with Pfäfersch, that the speech is genuine, but much is still problematical.—A. Oehler, *Der Kranz des Meleagros v. Gadara* [Berlin, 1920, Propyläen-Verlag] (Philipp). Text and translation; contains a very full critical discussion of the poets represented in the collection, and is of value even to the specialist.

**LATIN LITERATURE.**—H. Meusel, *C. Julii Caesaris commentarii de bello Gallico*, 17th ed., vols. II. and III. [Berlin, 1920. M.15 and M.9+60%] (Klotz). In this new edition much useful material for the interpretation of the text is collected, and valuable contributions are made by M. himself. Reviewer discusses many passages and readings, and comments on the omission of all questions of literary history.—G. Krüger, *Die Bibeldichtung zu Ausgang des Altertums* [Giessen, 1919. M.2] (Baehrens). Fascinating description of the development of early Christian poetry, Proba, Juvenius, Cyprian, etc. K. devotes special attention to Avitus.—J. Martin, *Die Vita et Passio Cypriani* [Histor. Jahrbuch, 1919] (Baehrens). M. rightly adopts Reitzenstein's view that Pontius' account must be accepted with great reserve owing to its panegyrical distortions. Reviewer establishes correct text in some instances with the help of Pontius' *clausulae*.

**HISTORY.**—R. Laqueur, *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus* [Giessen, 1920. M.33] (Helm). Reviewer concludes a lengthy and detailed discussion by expressing his complete disagreement with L., and refuses to be guided by one whose method of creating difficulties and thereby arriving at the most complicated results is not likely to win any general support.

**PHILOSOPHY.**—C. Ritter, *Platons Stellung zu den Aufgaben der Naturwissenschaft* [Heidelberg, 1919, Winter] (Nestle). A very useful

guide to Plato's physical and astronomical theories, and to his work and discoveries in the fields of natural science and of mathematics.—K. Deissner, *Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit*, 2nd ed. [Leipzig, 1921, Deichert. M.15] (Posselt). Reviewer refers to his criticism of the first edition (*B. Ph. W.*, 1918, 37/38), and only discusses the new matter contained in the second edition; though disagreeing with D. in many particulars, he acknowledges the scientific value of his book.—C. Siegel, *Platon und Sokrates* [Leipzig, 1920, Meiner. M.10] (Seeliger). An attempt, with Xenophon's help, to draw a picture of Socrates' personality, followed by a discussion of his influence on Plato's metaphysical speculations. Reviewer disagrees with S.'s chronology of Plato's writings.—A. v. Aster, *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie* [Berlin, 1920, de Gruyter] (Nestle). A thoroughly practical manual for students, compact, but not too meagre; little originality, but leading opinions reproduced in easily intelligible form. Print very small, paper exceptionally bad, full of misprints.

**ART AND ARCHAEOLOGY.**—Chr. Huelsen, *Der kleinere Palast in der Villa des Hadrian bei Tivoli* [Heidelberg, *Ark. Wiss.*, 1919] (Gaerthe). With the help of a plan found among the papers of the French architect Clérissieu, H. has succeeded in giving an adequate description of the West Palace ('Academy') in Hadrian's villa.—E. Weigand, *Vorgeschichte des korinthischen Kapitells* [Würzburg, 1920. M.6.50] (Weickert). Seeks to explain the origin of the Corinthian capital by following the earlier development of its chief component parts, and traces it back through the Syro-Phoenicians to Egypt. Reviewer, who expresses approval of W.'s method and agrees in the main with his argument, gives a careful summary of the book, to which he contributes criticisms and additions, and concludes with a brief discussion of Homolle's *L'origine du chapiteau corinthien* (*Rev. Arch.*, 1916).—G. Wilke, *Archäologische Erläuterung zur Germania des Tacitus* [Leipzig, 1921, Kabitzsch. M.12] (G. Wolff). Useful, but one-sided, and must be read with caution; confirms the reliability of Tacitus' historical and archaeological observations; deals more especially with N. and E. Germany.—R. Heberdey, *Altattische Porosskulptur* [Wien, 1919, Hölder. M.225] (Praschniker). With wonderful patience H. has succeeded in piecing together almost all the available fragments, and has combined these *disiecta membra* into eleven pediment groups, which reviewer carefully describes, mostly in terms of warm praise. H. also has a detailed chapter on the technique, style, and chronology. Excellently got up, and a worthy addition to the publications of the Austrian Archaeological Institute.—F. Behn, *Kataloge des Röm.-German. Centralmuseums, No. 8, Italische Altertümer vorhellenistischer Zeit* [Mainz, 1920, Wilckens. M.7] (Karo). The Mainz Museum contains a noteworthy series of objects representing almost every period

and district of Ancient Italy; these are well described in this catalogue, with bibliographical prefaces to each section. Reviewer adds a few corrections.—F. Weege, *Etruskische Malerei* [Halle, Niemeyer. M.180] (Karo). Reviewer expresses deep gratitude for this valuable book with its excellent plates, and hopes that the tantalising gaps which had to be left owing to paper shortage will soon be bridged in the promised second volume.

RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY.—P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*, 3rd ed. [München, 1920, Beck] (Pfister). General arrangement as in the second edition, but it is revised throughout and has many additions; indispensable to all interested in Greek cults. Reviewer criticises and discusses details of ritual, priesthood, etc.—R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen*, 2nd ed. [Leipzig, 1920, Teubner. M.12] (Gruppe). In the first edition (reviewed *B. Ph. W.*, 1911, 930 ff.) R. dealt too one-sidedly with Hellenistic mysteries derived from Egypt; recent thorough investigations of Mandaean and Manichaean writings and the assistance of specialists like Andreas, Le Coq, and Lidzbarski have enabled him to give the second edition a broader foundation; a real contribution to our knowledge of the subject.—R. Ganszyniec, *De Agathodaemone* [Soc. des Sciences de Varsovie, 1919] (Gruppe). Not altogether original, but a careful collection and sifting of evidence; should not be overlooked by those interested in ἀγαθοδαίμων.

LINGUISTIC.—J. E. Kalitsunakis, *Mittel- und neugriechische Erklärungen bei Eustathius* [Berlin, 1919, de Gruyter. M.8+100%] (Maidhof). Attempts to sketch from Eustathius' language the ordinary speech of a twelfth-century Greek; the selected words are subjected to a wonderfully thorough morphological and semasiological examination; equally instructive to students of Classical, Byzantine, and Modern Greek. Reviewer contributes many additions.—A. Gagnér, *De hercle mehercle ceterisque id genus*

*particulis priscae poesis Latinae scaenicae* [Greifswald, 1920] (Klotz). Somewhat prolix and not without blemishes; but it is a complete and handy collection of the expressions under discussion.—A. H. Salonijs, *Vitae Patrum* [Lund. M.42+200%] (Baehrens). A valuable contribution to our knowledge of Late Latin; S. has a correct appreciation of the historical development of language, and philologists in particular will find his book very stimulating. Reviewer criticises in some detail, and contributes many additions and corrections.—G. J. Laing, *The genitive of value in Latin and other constructions with verbs of rating* [Chicago, 1920, University Press] (Meltzer). Examines as completely as possible instances from Plautus to Aulus Gellius and typical examples from the latter to Gregory of Tours; appears to prove his main contention that the genitive of value is a parallel construction to the partitive genitive and the genitive of quality.—F. Brender, *Die rückläufige Ableitung im Lateinischen*, [Lausanne, 1920, La Concorde] (Meltzer). A detailed investigation of regressive derivation, more particularly in Vulgar and Late Latin; B. has obtained some excellent results.

PALAEOGRAPHY AND LEXICOGRAPHY.—W. A. Oldfather, A. S. Pease, and H. V. Canter, *Index verborum quae in Senecae fabulis necnon in Octavia praetexta reperiuntur* [University of Illinois Studies, 1918] (Tolkiehn). An exemplary piece of work; exact and complete.—C. U. Clark, *Collectanea Hispanica* [Paris, 1920, Champion] (Lehmann). Does not pretend to be exhaustive, but will prove a valuable help to theologians, philologists, and historians who are concerned with MSS. in Visigothic script.—H. J. Vogels, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Diatessaron im Abendland* [Münster, Aschendorff. M.7] (Pott). V. deserves thanks for his work, which no student in this field should overlook. Reviewer criticises V.'s methods in some particulars.—A. Pott, *De textu evangeliorum in Saeculo Secundo* [Mnemosyne, 1920] (Tolkiehn). Full and convincing justification of his disagreement with v. Soden's critical method in dealing with the text of the New Testament.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\*.\* Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

*A Study in the Commerce of Latium from the Early Iron Age through the Sixth Century B.C.* By Louise E. W. Adams. Classical Studies, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.: 1921.

*Allison* (Sir R.). Translations into English Verse, mainly from the Greek Anthology. 7½ × 5¾". Pp. xii+70. London: A. L. Humphreys, 1921. 3s. 6d. net.

*American Journal of Philology.* Vol. XLII. 1. (No. 165.) January, February, March, 1921. Edited by C. W. E. Miller. 10½" × 6". Pp. 96. Vol. XLII. 2. (No. 166.) April, May, June, 1921. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1921.

*Andreades* (A. M.). Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Δημοσίας Οἰκονομίας, ἀπὸ τῶν ἡρώϊκων χρόνων μέχρι τῆς συστάσεως τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ βασιλείου. One vol. 10" × 7". Pp. xii+624. Athens: A. Raphtanis, 1918. Drach. 18.

- Aristotle*. Translated into English. Vol. X. *Politica*, by B. Jowett. *Oeconomica*, by E. S. Forster. *Atheniensium Respublica*, by Sir F. G. Kenyon. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Athenian Political Commissions*. A dissertation by Frederick D. Smith. University of Chicago Libraries, 1920.
- Brenot* (A.) *Sur l'Éphébie Attique*. 10" x 6½". Pp. xx + 50. Paris: E. Champion, 1920. Fr. 9.50.
- Casson* (S.) and *Brooke* (D.) *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum*. Vol. II.: *Sculpture and Architectural Fragments*. 7½" x 5¼". Pp. xii + 460. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. Cloth, 36s. net.
- Classical Philology*. Vol. XVI. 3. July, 1921. University of Chicago Press.
- Crum* (W. E.) *Short Texts from Coptic Ostraca and Papyri*. 11½" x 9". Pp. xii + 150. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Half-cloth, 16s. net.
- Dimsdale* (M. S.) *Happy Days and Other Essays*. 8½" x 5½". Pp. xvi + 94. Cambridge: Heffer, 1921. Half-cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Donovan* (J.) *Theory of Advanced Greek Prose Composition, with a Digest of Greek Idioms*. Part I.
- Esposito* (M.) *Textes et Études de Littérature Ancienne et Médiévale*. Fasc. I. 9" x 6". Pp. 64. Florence: Published by Author, 1921.
- Goodell* (T. D.) *Athenian Tragedy: A Study in Popular Art*. 7½" x 5". Pp. 298. Oxford: University Press, 1920. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Harrison* (J. E.) *Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 40. Cambridge University Press, 1921. 3s. 6d. net.
- Heitland* (W. E.) *Agricola: A Study of Agricultural Life in the Graeco-Roman World from the Point of View of Labour*. 10" x 6½". Pp. x + 492. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. Cloth, 47s. 6d. net.
- Herzog* (Dr. R.) *Aus der Geschichte des Bankwesens in Altertum: Terrae Numulariae*. 10" x 7½". Pp. 42. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1919. M. 4.
- Hjort* (Dr. J.) *The Unity of Science*. 7¾" x 5¼". Pp. vi + 176. London: Gyldendal, 1921. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Indogermanische Grammatik*. Teil II. *Der Indogermanische Vokalismus*, von Hermann Hirt. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1921. 7s.
- Isaacs* (W. H.) *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. 10¼" x 7½". Pp. viii + 88. Oxford: University Press, 1921. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Juret* (A. C.) *Manuel de Phonétique Latine*. 10" x 6½". Pp. 390. Paris: Hachette and Co., 1921. Fr. 75.
- Lindsay* (W. M., F.B.A.) *The Corpus, Épinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glossaries*. 8¾" x 5½". Pp. viii + 122. The Oxford University Press, 1921. 15s. net.
- Lindsay* (W. M.) *The Corpus Glossary*. 9" x 5½". Pp. xvi + 292. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Livingstone* (R. W.) and *Freeman* (C. E.) *Caesar's Gallic War*. Books VI. and VII., partly in the original and partly in translation. 7½" x 5". Pp. 160. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Paper boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Loeb Classical Library: Godley* (A. D.) *Herodotus*. Vol. II. Pp. xviii + 416. *Frazer* (Sir J. G.) *Apollodorus*. Vol. I. Pp. lix + 404. Vol. II. Pp. vi + 546. *Perrin* (B.) *Plutarch's Lives*. Vol. X. Pp. x + 400. *Brownson* (C. L.) *Xenophon Hellenica*. VI. and VII. *Anabasis*. I.-III. Pp. vi + 514. *Butler* (H. E.) *Quintilian*. Vol. II. Pp. vi + 532. 6¾" x 4¼". London: Heinemann, 1921. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Martin* (D.) *The Cynegetica of Nemesianus* (Doctors' Thesis). 7¾" x 5¼". Pp. 84. Cornell University Press, 1917.
- Martin* (G.) *Laus Pisonis* (Doctors' Thesis). 7¾" x 5¼". Pp. 98. Cornell University, 1917.
- Palamas* (Kostas). *A Hundred Voices and other Poems*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by A. E. Phourides. 9½" x 6". Pp. vi + 227. Harvard University Press, 1921. Paper boards, \$2.50.
- Photiades* (P. St.) *Ἑρμηνευτικά καὶ διορθωτικά, and Ἑρμῆν πρὸς γάμον*. 9" x 6½". Pp. 156. Athens: P. Sakellarios, 1921. Paper.
- de Pachtère* (F. G.) *La Table Hypothécaire de Veleia*. 10" x 6½". Pp. xx + 120. Paris: E. Champion, 1920.
- Rhoades* (J.) *The Poems of Virgil* (translated). *The World's Classics*. 6" x 3¾". Pp. xii + 424. Oxford: University Press. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Sandys* (Sir J. E.) *A History of Classical Scholarship, from the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages*. Vol. I. Third edition. 7½" x 5¼". Pp. xxiv + 702. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Smith* (J. C.) *A Book of Verse, from Langland to Kipling*. 7½" x 5". Pp. 298. Oxford: University Press, 1921. Paper boards.
- Songs of the Groves* (Records of the Ancient World). 5" x 8". Pp. xx + 144. Steyning: The Vine Press, 1921. Paper boards, 7s. 6d. net.
- Van Groningen* (B. A.) *De Papyro Oxyrhynchita*, 1380. 6¾" x 5¼". Pp. 84. Leenwarden (Holland): B. A. van Groningen, 1921. 3s.
- Wells* (H. G.) *The New Teaching of History*. With a reply to some recent criticisms of *The Outline of History*. 9" x 5¼". Pp. 35. London: Cassell and Co., 1921. Paper, 1s. net.
- Wells* (H. G.) *The Salvaging of Civilisation*. 8" x 5¼". Pp. 202. London: Cassell, 1921. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Texts for Students*, No. 26. *The Hymn of Cleanthes*. Translated by E. H. Blakeney. 7" x 5". Pp. 16. London: S.P.C.K., 1921. 6d. net.
- The Odyssey*. Translated by F. Caulfield. 7¾" x 5¼". Pp. xii + 412. London: G. Bell, 1921. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.



